

MESSAGES FROM THE BATTLEFIELD:
RELATIONSHIPS OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN
DEPLOYED CITIZEN-SOLDIERS
AND COLLEAGUES ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

BY

C2010

Beverly Porter Payne

B.S.B.A., Missouri Western State University, 1984

M.B.A., University of Missouri—Kansas City, 1990

Submitted to the Department of Communication Studies
and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.

Dr. Tracy Russo, Chairperson

Dr. Donn Parson

Dr. Nancy Baym

Dr. Suzy D'Enbeau

Dr. Paul Markham

Date defended: April 19, 2010

The Dissertation Committee for Beverly Porter Payne certifies that this is the
approved version of the following dissertation:

MESSAGES FROM THE BATTLEFIELD:
RELATIONSHIPS OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN
DEPLOYED CITIZEN-SOLDIERS
AND COLLEAGUES ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Committee:

Dr. Tracy Russo, Chairperson

Date approved: _____

ABSTRACT

Organizational commitment, or the extent to which employees are psychologically attached to or involved in their organization, is important to overall organizational success. The strength of the attachment and the dominant component of organizational commitment—affective, normative, or continuance—have implications for behavioral outcomes of employees. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships of communication with civilian colleagues and non-deployed military peers and leaders to changes in post-deployed organizational commitment of Army National Guard and Army Reservists. Frequency and channels of communication were examined. Additionally, relationships of deployment experiences, changes to the civilian organization, and recognition during reintegration were assessed.

The study found that with the exception of continuance commitment to the civilian organization, all levels of post-deployment commitment to both organizations experienced a statistically significant decrease. Support messages, workplace changes, leadership changes, combat exposure, and satisfaction with recognition by the civilian organization were found to be associated with changes in commitment.

DEDICATION

To all the men and women of the Army National Guard and Army Reserves who willingly sacrifice so much as you bravely serve our country, this dissertation is dedicated to you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation represents the final stage of the journey to complete my doctorate; a journey that took me twenty years to begin. Without the support and encouragement from many faculty members, family, friends, and colleagues, I would not be writing these acknowledgements today. You encouraged me that starting a doctorate at age 50 was a worthwhile endeavor. For this, I thank all of you.

To the faculty of the communication studies department, thank you for guiding me and teaching me what it means to be a scholar. I extend a special thank you to Dr. Tracy Russo, my dissertation chair. Words are inadequate to express how grateful I am to you. You pushed me to embrace scholarly writing and inspired me to think critically while continually encouraging me. Your unwavering support and feedback, particularly during the writing of this dissertation, kept me on my path. And, along the way, I came to view you as not only my mentor, but as my friend.

I am grateful to my other committee members, Dr. Donn Parson, Dr. Nancy Baym, Dr. Suzy D'Enbeau, and Dr. Paul Markham. Each of you provided me helpful guidance throughout this project.

One of the most rewarding times for me at KU was the year I had an "office" in Bailey Hall with other students. During that year, I enjoyed the camaraderie and support of my wonderful friends. In particular, Katie Fischer Clune, Amber Messersmith, Stephenson Beck, and Andrew Ledbetter enriched my graduate experience. Thank you for your support and friendship.

Without the support from my colleagues and friends at Missouri Western State University, I would not have been able to complete this project. First, to Dr. Jeanne Daffron, Dr. Brenda Blessing, Dr. Larry Lawson, and Dean Carol Roevers, thank you for demonstrating your confidence in me by approving my program of study at KU. Additionally, your words of encouragement helped me stay focused on my journey. To Tom Williamson, Peggy Leland, Cherie Gemmell, and Sandy Samuel, thank you for always encouraging me although my absence from work created additional work for you. Peggy, thank you for sending me cards of encouragement that came at the times when I needed them the most. And, Tom, thank you for sharing your military expertise with me.

I want to thank my friends who continually reached out and offered support to me. To Gordon, Mike S., Todd, Denise, Matty, Ruth, and Joan; thank you for not giving up on our friendship!

Finally, my family has been a source of constant support and encouragement. Thank you to my daughters, Amy, Jeannette, and Jessica, for being so understanding when “Mom” was not always available. Your understanding and love helped me throughout my journey. To Mike, I want to thank you for believing in me and for adding to your responsibilities during times when I was busy. To my sister, Cherri, thank you for constant love and encouragement. And finally, to my parents, Don and Della Porter, quite simply I could not have finished my journey without your love and support. You constantly encouraged me and understood what I needed in order to be successful. The Lord has blessed our family richly, and for that I thank Him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACCEPTANCE	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER ONE: Introduction	1
CHAPTER TWO: Review of Literature	9
Battlefield Communication	9
Organizational Commitment	14
Repatriation and Reintegration	29
CHAPTER THREE: Method	38
Research Design	38
Participants and Data Collection	39
Instruments	43
Data Analysis	52
CHAPTER FOUR: Results	55
Data Screening	55

Participant Demographics	56
Extent of Communication	59
Channels of Communication	60
Organizational Commitment	63
Frequency of Communication and Message Content	67
Deployment Experiences	73
Changes to the Civilian Workplace	75
Reintegration to the Civilian Organization	76
CHAPTER FIVE: Discussion	80
Review of Findings	80
Implications	98
Limitations and Directions for Future Research	101
REFERENCES	104
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Facebook Message to Friends	120
Appendix B: Facebook Message to those who Report Army National Guard or Reserve Participation	121
Appendix C: Facebook Message to those Referenced in a News Article	122
Appendix D: Informed Consent	123

Appendix E: Survey	124
Appendix F: Correlation Matrix – Message Content.....	137
Appendix G: Correlation Matrix – Deployment Experiences	138
Appendix H: Correlation Matrix – Changes to the Civilian Workplace	139

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Participants' Demographic Characteristics.....	57
Table 2: Frequency of Communication by Organization and Relationship.....	61
Table 3: Communication Channels Used by Organization and Relationship.....	62
Table 4: Means and Standard Deviations for Organizational Commitment to the Civilian Organization.....	64
Table 5: Means and Standard Deviations for Organizational Commitment to the Civilian Organization by Employment Status	66
Table 6: Means and Standard Deviations for Organizational Commitment to the Military Organization	67
Table 7: Frequency of Communication	70
Table 8: Combat Exposure and Mean Differences in Changes to Organizational Commitment.....	75

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States marked the beginning of change for Americans. The sense of safety Americans once felt while living in their country began to erode as they faced the reality of the attacks and the enormous loss of life. The government immediately responded with heightened security measures that complicated airline travel, increased security on borders, developed postal regulations to identify suspicious mail, and passed the Patriot Act allowing law enforcement officials greater access to individual privacy. In time, these changes, while inconvenient, became part of the daily routine of most Americans.

However, one change resulting from the 9/11 attacks significantly altered the daily lives of a specific group of Americans unlike any other, the military reservists and National Guard personnel. Often called citizen-soldiers or weekend warriors, reservists and guard personnel traditionally fulfilled their military commitment by serving one weekend per month and completing two weeks of annual training. Additionally, reservists and guard personnel can be activated and required to serve short periods of additional service to provide assistance during local, state, or federal emergencies such as Hurricane Katrina. Their traditional role and mission, however, changed after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, which marked the beginning of an era where the magnitude of reserve activations reached historical proportions (Loughran, Klerman, & Savych, 2006).

Between September 2001 and the end of November 2007, approximately 30% or 457,000 of the total number of troops deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan were reservists or guard personnel (Waterhouse & O'Bryant, 2008). Since the war began, approximately two-thirds of the country's 550,000 reservists have been placed on active duty (Moskos, 2005). Not only is this the largest number of reservists who have faced combat duty since World War II, but their deployments have been for longer periods, many for 18 months, and often longer than deployments for active-duty soldiers (Clinton, 2004; Loughran et al., 2006; Moskos, 2005; Palmeri, Grow, & Crock, 2004). Additionally, as the war on the Mideast continues, 84,000 reservists have been deployed more than one time (Korb, Rundlet, Bergmann, Duggan, & Juul, 2007).

Although citizen-soldiers from all military service branches have been activated in support of the war, the majority have been Army Reserve and Army National Guard¹ members. Heavy reliance on Army Reservist and Army National Guard citizen-soldiers has remained consistent over the course of the conflict. In December 2004, they represented 86% of all citizen-soldiers activated; in June 2009, they comprised 77% of the total reserve forces activated (Army National Guard, 2004; Army National Guard, 2009).

Despite the addition of 65,000 troops to the all volunteer, active-duty

¹ The federal government manages reserve units whereas Guard units are under state management. However, the President of the United States or the Secretary of Defense can "activate" state National Guard members into Federal military service during times of need. For the remainder of this paper, the term "reservists" or "reserves" includes both National Guard and Reserve units or soldiers.

manpower, the Army still falls short of handling lengthy conflicts without relying on its reserve component. To meet current operational demands without utilizing reserve units, more than 250,000 additional soldiers would be required, which, while an economically viable target, is not feasible without reinstatement of the draft (Bailey, 2007; Scully, 2008). According to General Charles Campbell, U.S. Army Forces Command, the result of these troop constraints is the military's continued reliance on the Army National Guard and Reserve forces for an additional generation (Scully, 2008).

This continued reliance on reservists, particularly Army reserve components, presents a multitude of challenges for reservists, their families, communities, and civilian employers that merits further examination. Scholars have examined the effects these lengthy deployments have on retention and morale of reservists (Griffith, 2005; Kirby & Naftel, 2000; Milliken, Auchterlonie, & Hoge, 2007; Moskos, 2005; Stetz, Castro, & Bliese, 2007), psychological distress experienced by reservists (Friedman, 2006; Kangt, Natelson, Mahan, Lee, & Murphy, 2003; Milliken et al., 2007; Stuart & Bliese, 1998), relationships with family members and children (Friedman, 2006; Milliken et al., 2007), and changes to local economic conditions (Loughran et al., 2006). Others have examined the effects on employers who are faced with meeting customers' demands without the services of their trained employees while at the same time remaining under obligation to follow employment laws protecting deployed reservists (Deligiannis, 2003; Settle, 2006).

Statement of the Problem

Although scholars have examined several aspects of the extensive use of reservists in the current Middle East operations, one area remains relatively unexplored. What has not been studied in any depth is the reintegration process experienced by reservists when they return to civilian employment once their deployment ends. As de-activated reservists return to their civilian organizations, how different are the employees being welcomed home from when they first deployed? What effects have the lengthy absence and war experiences of the citizen-soldier had on their organizational commitment?

Scholars have linked organizational commitment to work-related attitudes and behaviors, including turnover intention and actual turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001), absenteeism (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979; Somers, 1995), job performance (Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, & Jackson, 1989; Riketta, 2002), and job satisfaction (Bateman & Strasser, 1984). Given the contribution of these attitudes and behaviors to organizational effectiveness, employers value a committed workforce.

This study examines the channels of communication and the content of communication that post-deployed reservists had during deployment with coworkers and managers in both their civilian and military organizations. Furthermore, the relationships of this communication to the post-deployed reservists' (a) perceptions of affective, normative, and continuance commitment to both their civilian and military organizations upon their return, (b) differences in perceptions of pre- and post-

deployment commitment levels for both organizations, and (c) reintegration experiences are examined. Finally, the relationship of reservists' deployment experiences and perceived changes to their civilian organizations on the three levels of commitment to both organizations are assessed.

Research Questions

Specifically, this study addresses the following research questions:

- RQ1: To what extent do post-deployed reservists report communication during their deployment with coworkers, supervisors and managers from their civilian employer and with their non-deployed peers and leaders from their Army Reserve or Army National Guard unit?
- RQ2: What communication channels do post-deployed reservists report using to communicate with civilian coworkers, supervisors, managers, and non-deployed military peers and leaders during their deployment?
- RQ3a: Are there significant differences between post-deployed reservists' pre- and post-deployment reports of affective, normative, and continuance commitment to their civilian organization?
- RQ3b: Are there significant differences between the changes in affective, normative, and continuance commitment levels to the civilian organization of post-deployed reservists reporting separation from their pre-deployment civilian employer and those reporting continued employment?

- RQ4: Are there significant differences between post-deployed reservists' pre- and post-deployment reports of affective, normative, and continuance commitment to their Army Reserve or Army National Guard unit?
- RQ5: To what extent did message content and frequency of communication with civilian colleagues and non-deployed reserve members during reservists' deployment influence the differences in reported levels of affective, normative, and continuance commitment to their civilian and military organizations?
- RQ6: To what extent did reservists' deployment experiences influence the differences in their perceived levels of affective, normative, and continuance commitment to their civilian and military organizations?
- RQ7: To what extent did changes in the civilian workplace reported by post-deployed reservists influence the differences in their perceived levels of affective, normative, and continuance commitment to their civilian organization?
- RQ8: What do post-deployed reservists propose would have facilitated their reintegration to their civilian organization after deployment?

Contribution

Studying the relationships of communication to the affective, normative, and continuance commitment levels of Army Reservists and National Guard members returning from deployment may provide both scholarly and pragmatic contributions.

First, findings from this study may advance the scholarly literature on the role of communication as it relates to organizational commitment and perceived organizational support. Meyer et al. (2002) reported in their meta-analysis on commitment that communication, particularly between managers and employees, is an antecedent to organizational commitment. Despite this, a recent search of the scholarly journals in the communication discipline on the topic of organizational commitment revealed a limited number of contemporary studies on the effects communication has on organizational commitment. More recent studies on organizational commitment and perceived organizational support, however, were identified in the scholarly literature in management and psychology disciplines. Given that this study closely examines the relationship of the communicator, medium, and message content on commitment, it can provide additional literature in this area.

Second, the findings from this study may have pragmatic implications for organizations adjusting to the loss, albeit temporary, of valued employees. Employees who are experienced, trained, and possess high skill levels are not easily replaced. When the United States Army activates and deploys reservists from all walks of life, it creates gaps in civilian organizations' ability to accomplish their objectives. This gap is widened if the deployment experience results in poor reintegration or repatriation of the employee, which could culminate in the employee's permanent separation from the company. Ultimately, these findings will be used to offer strategies enabling civilian employers to not only show support for

their deployed reservists but also to facilitate returning reservists' transition from warrior to worker.

Organization

This chapter of the dissertation introduced the problem and research questions to be addressed in the study. In the following chapter, the literature relative to this study -- battlefield communication, repatriation and reintegration, and organizational commitment -- is reviewed. The survey instrument and data collection methods are described in the third chapter. Research findings and data analysis are presented in chapter four. Discussion and implications of the results along with the research limitations and suggestions for future research are offered in chapter five.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

Reservists are deployed for varying spans of time, often for more than a year. Once demobilized, they begin the reintegration process as they return to their civilian and military organizations. This study examines the relationship of communication between deployed Army Reservists and their civilian and non-deployed military colleagues on their perceived organizational commitment to their civilian employer and military unit. To establish the context for this study, this chapter reviews the literature on battlefield communication, organizational commitment, and repatriation and reintegration.

Battlefield Communication

“A major characteristic of war has been the soldier’s isolation from spouses, family, friends, and the larger society” (Ender & Segal, 1998, p. 66).

Throughout time, soldiers have sought a means to send messages to or receive messages and information from their friends and family at home. As far back as the Civil War, soldiers wrote tens of thousands of letters to anxious friends and family members. “Mail call” in World War II was associated with making soldiers’ loneliness bearable while strengthening fortitude and morale (Litoff & Smith, 1990). The enormous volume of mail during World War II led to the creation of Victory Mail (V-Mail) by the American government. Designed to save space on military cargo planes, V-Mail letters, written on specially designed notebook-sized paper,

were reduced onto microfilm for shipping and then enlarged to the size of a postcard for delivery (Litoff & Smith, 1990). The Military Affiliate Radio System (MARS), established in 1948, provided U.S. soldiers during the Korean and Vietnam conflicts the first opportunity for free, two-way radio communication with loved ones (Schumm, Bell, Ender, & Rice, 2004; Wong & Gerras, 2006). Beginning with the Grenada invasion, soldiers have had access to telephones (although expensive) to call home (Wong & Gerras, 2006).

It was during the Gulf War in 1990 and 1991 that e-mail emerged as the key means for deployed soldiers to maintain contact with the home-front (Wong & Gerras, 2006). Additionally, some soldiers had access to facsimile (fax), videotapes, and teleconferences (Schumm et al., 2004). In a 2005 interview with a *New York Times* reporter where he discussed his study of soldier communication, Ender stated that “more than 95 percent of military personnel in Iraq report using e-mail, and nearly two-thirds say they use it three or more times a week” (Wielawski, 2005). This use of new communication media by soldiers is occurring within the larger context of expanding technology reconfiguring personal relationships, social institutions, and the political economy (Schumm et al., 2004).

Segovia, a corporate leader in managed satellite network services, was contracted in 2003 by the United States government to provide satellite broadband Internet access throughout Iraq including Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) phone capability (Wong & Gerras, 2006). As a result, soldiers could place phone calls to the United States for only four cents per minute (Wong & Gerras, 2006). However,

innovative Iraqi entrepreneurs offered soldiers another option for real-time, inexpensive, and more convenient communication. Soldiers could have a satellite dish and router installed in their living quarters and individual e-mail accounts established (Wong & Gerras, 2006). Soldiers were eager to take advantage of this technology to engage in more frequent communication with loved ones at home. By agreeing to share costs, soldiers spent approximately \$300 for the equipment and \$30 monthly for high-speed internet access; installation costs were later recovered when equipment was sold to the next incoming unit (Wong & Gerras, 2006). Soldiers embraced this technology and quickly began using webcams to access this service. Deployed soldiers began real-time, face-to-face communication with their family and friends.

Not only has the means by which deployed soldiers communicate changed, but so has the frequency and quality of their communication. In their study of enlisted soldiers deployed in support of Operation IRAQI FREEDOM (OIF), Wong and Gerras (2006) reported being surprised that soldiers at forward operating bases reported frequent e-mail usage as well as real-time communication via telephone or text messaging with family members several times daily. Additionally, Wong and Gerras (2006) reported that the quality of the interactions between soldiers and family members reflected a depth and level unattainable in only written letters or e-mail. Soldiers were emotionally involved, in real time, as they dealt with issues and problems on the home-front.

The availability and affordability of synchronous communications has resulted in increased morale for deployed soldiers (Wong & Gerras, 2006). By retaining their

roles as father, mother, spouse, son, or daughter, deployed soldiers are involved in and connected with the day-to-day activities of their families. Additionally, this increased social connection or reduced social isolation of soldiers may have other positive effects. Remaining emotionally connected and communicating with family while deployed may minimize the feelings of social isolation that have a strong association with post-traumatic stress disorder (Miller et al., 2002). Finally, these increased connections with family members during deployment have the potential to minimize problems during the soldiers' reintegration. Returning soldiers have expressed concerns about whether their families will still need them; spouses, on the other hand, have worried about relinquishing their independence and decision-making abilities upon their soldier's return to the family (Wong & Gerras, 2006). However, if through frequent communication during deployment the soldier remains an integral part of family problem-solving and decision-making processes, it may moderate reintegration issues.

This use of new technology by soldiers to facilitate family interactions, maintain and enhance marriages, and foster friendships from a distance parallels industry use of technology to maintain feelings of connectedness with telecommuters. This similarity has led some scholars to refer to the military family as "tele-family commuters" (Schumm et al., 2004).

Employee value. The importance of human capital, whether telecommuters, expatriates, or home office employees, to a firm's success has been argued by organizational and human resource management scholars (Hitt, Bierman, Shimizu, &

Kochhar, 2001; Wright, Dunford, & Snell, 2001). Hitt et al. (2001) also posited that the relationship between human capital and performance is curvilinear; that is, a return on the investment of costly human capital may not be realized until employee skills are developed over time, which then results in increased effectiveness.

Considering this relationship, along with the previously mentioned relationship between employee turnover and commitment, employers have a vested interest in maintaining a connection with their deployed reservists.

Widespread access to communication technology along with the unprecedented number of reservists deployed to support the war on terror is at the center of this study. With both families and corporate America using technology to maintain member roles and foster connectedness, the question becomes whether or not deployed reservists use available technology to maintain their role in and connection to their civilian employer and local military unit. Therefore, this study must first address the following research questions:

RQ1: To what extent do post-deployed reservists report communication during their deployment with coworkers, supervisors, and managers from their civilian employer and with their non-deployed peers and leaders from their Army Reserve or Army National Guard unit?

RQ2: What communication channels do post-deployed reservists report using to communicate with civilian coworkers, supervisors, managers, and non-deployed military peers and leaders during their deployment?

Organizational Commitment

Communication and employee turnover are also linked to another construct in the scholarly literature on organizations. This construct, organizational commitment, is reviewed next.

Workplace or organizational commitment has held the interest of organizational scholars representing multiple disciplines and practitioners for several decades. Resulting from this scholarly interest is a large body of literature seeking a better understanding of the definition of organizational commitment, the foci or targets of commitment, the antecedents of commitment, and the myriad of work-place behaviors associated with having a committed workforce. Practitioner interest in workplace commitment is not surprising given the research findings associating employee commitment with positive behavioral implications including decreased turnover intention (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Somers, 1995; Tett & Meyer, 1993), lower absenteeism (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979; Somers, 1995), improved job performance (Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, & Jackson, 1989), and job satisfaction (Bateman & Strasser, 1984).

Commitment *in general* has been conceptualized and measured by scholars in a variety of ways. In their review of the commitment literature, Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) concluded that common to all definitions of commitment is a reference to it as a stabilizing force that guides behavior. However, variations to the definition focus on specific targets or foci (e.g., organization, profession, or supervisor) of commitment. Furthermore, Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) posited that

commitment is distinguishable from exchange-based theories of motivation because when viewed as a binding force, commitment influences behavior that may appear to be contrary to an individual's self interest.

Variances in the conceptualization of commitment in general have resulted in differences in how scholars define organizational or workplace commitment. Allen and Meyer (1990) defined organizational commitment as “a psychological state that binds the individual to the organization (i.e. makes turnover less likely) (p.14). Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) defined organizational commitment as “the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (p. 226). Weiner's (1982) definition included “normative pressures to act in a way which meets organizational goals and interests” (p. 421). However, common to all conceptualizations of organizational commitment is a link to employee turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

Differences in the conceptualization of organizational or workplace commitment pertain to the psychological state or origin of the stabilizing force, the antecedent conditions fostering the development of commitment, and behavioral outcomes (other than turnover intention) stemming from commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). In an effort to synthesize the research on organizational commitment, Meyer and Allen (1991) developed one of the most researched and ultimately supported multidimensional models of organizational commitment (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001).

Meyer and Allen's Three-Component Model of Organizational

Commitment. In addition to synthesizing existing research on organizational commitment, Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model was an attempt to resolve the confusion resulting from differences in the conceptualization and measurement of organizational commitment. They argued that although commitment was commonly viewed as a binding force experienced as a mind-set or frame of mind, less consensus existed about the nature of the mind-set. In their three-component model, Meyer and Allen (1991, see also Allen & Meyer, 1990) posited that this psychological state stemmed from one or more of three distinguishable mind-states. They labeled these mind-states, representing the three components of their model, as affective, continuance, and normative commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Affective commitment. Rooted in Kanter's (1968) concept of cohesion commitment, which is defined as "the attachment of an individual's fund of affectivity and emotion to the group" (p. 507), affective commitment represents an emotional attachment to the organization. Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) characterized affective commitment as an individual's acceptance of organizational values and a desire to remain at the organization. Employees who are affectively committed to an organization identify with, are involved in, and enjoy membership. Affectively committed employees remain with the organization because of their desire to do so.

Continuance commitment. Derived from Becker's (1960) concept of 'side-bets,' continuance commitment represents the desire to remain with an organization resulting from recognition of the costs associated with terminating the relationship. This theory asks that one considers employees who invest time in learning skills that are not transferrable to other organizations, who have significant years of seniority, or who have vested pensions. These employees are 'betting' that their time and energy with the company will essentially pay off if they continue their employment in the organization. Employees who remain with an organization because it costs too much to leave, or stay because they perceive they believe they have no other choices, demonstrate continuance commitment.

Normative commitment. Less common than affective or continuance commitment, normative commitment represents a belief about one's responsibility or obligation to an organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Weiner (1982) described normative commitment as internalized pressures to act in ways that meet organizational goals and suggested that employees display these behaviors because "they believe it is the 'right' and moral thing to do" (p. 421). Familial and cultural socialization as well as organizational socialization influence an employee's normative commitment (Weiner, 1982). For example, an employee who has family members or significant others who have been long-term employees of an organization, would be most likely to demonstrate normative commitment. Employees who continue employment because they feel obligated to or that they should remain demonstrate normative commitment.

Meyer and Allen (1997, 1991) argued that affective, continuance, and normative commitment are distinguishable components, not types, of commitment, and as such, are not mutually exclusive. Although affective and normative commitment are highly correlated, the differences in magnitude of correlations with antecedent variables suggest they are distinguishable dimensions (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). Therefore, employees' commitment to their organization could consist of varying degrees of all three components or dimensions (Meyer & Allen, 1997, 1991). For example, an employee could feel a strong desire to continue working for an organization but feel little or no obligation to do so. Another might enjoy working for the company but also recognizes that leaving would present an economic challenge. Because an employee's commitment profile likely consists of more than one dimension, Meyer and Allen (1997, 1991) suggest that researchers measure all three components simultaneously.

Foci or Targets of Organizational Commitment. The individuals or groups with whom employees identify or attach to are the foci of commitment (Reichers, 1985). As previously noted, conceptualizations of commitment vary based upon the foci or targets of commitment (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Although theoretical work on organizational commitment focused on the organization itself as the target of commitment, contemporary research recognizes the existence of multiple foci because organizations are comprised of many subgroups. Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) illustrated the necessity of examining commitment using a multidimensional lens by demonstrating that employees not only display different components or forms

of commitment to the same target, but also display commitment to multiple targets. For example, employees can be committed to occupations (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993), top management, supervisors, work groups (Becker et al., 1996; Becker, 1992), and unions (Angle & Perry, 1986).

Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) argued that understanding both the form(s) or dimension(s) of commitment and the foci are advantageous to predicting the outcomes of commitment. Furthermore, this knowledge provides guidance for managers interested in fostering specific components of commitment among employees.

In the present study, deployed reservists, unlike expatriates working for the same organization albeit at an overseas location, are essentially employed by two different organizations. Additionally, the differences in the nature of the work performed by and the work environment of deployed reservists can be extreme. Understanding reservists' perceptions of their reported levels and foci of commitment, both before and after deployment, may assist civilian employers manage post-deployed reservists' reintegration process. Therefore, the following questions are advanced by this research:

RQ3a: Are there significant differences between post-deployed reservists' pre- and post-deployment reports of affective, normative, and continuance commitment to their civilian organization?

RQ3b: Are there significant differences between the changes in affective, normative, and continuance commitment levels to the civilian organization of

post-deployed reservists reporting separation from their pre-deployment civilian employer and those reporting continued employment?

RQ4: Are there significant differences between post-deployed reservists' pre- and post-deployment reports of affective, normative, and continuance commitment to their Army Reserve or Army National Guard unit?

Antecedents of Organizational Commitment. Identifying the antecedents to commitment, and specifically organizational commitment, has generated significant scholarly interest including completion of several meta-analyses (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002). To identify the factors leading to the development of commitment, Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) postulated that the mind-sets or attitudes associated with commitment must be considered. In Meyer and Allen's three-component model, desire is the mind-set characterizing affective commitment, perceived cost is associated with continuance commitment, and obligation with normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1990; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). For example, managerial actions taken to improve affective commitment must foster desire or strengthen the emotional bond between the employee and the organization, whereas an employer-funded retirement plan may foster the need to stay, or continuance commitment.

In the most recent meta-analysis assessing antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment, antecedent variables were grouped into four categories: demographic variables, individual differences, work experiences, and alternative/investments (Meyer et al., 2002). In reporting their findings that

demographic variables overall have little effect in developing any form of organizational commitment, Meyer et al., reconfirmed Mathieu and Zajac's (1990) outcomes. External locus of control and task self-efficacy, variables in the individual differences category, correlated only with affective commitment; they correlated negatively for locus of control and positively for self-efficacy (Meyer et al., 2002). All alternative/investment variables correlated more strongly with continuance commitment, as expected, except investments (Meyer et al., 2002).

For organizational scholars and practitioners, however, the most significant findings reported by Meyer et al. (2002) were the stronger correlations between work experience variables and affective commitment. Positive correlation with affective commitment was reported for five (organizational support; transformational leadership; interactional, distributive, and procedural justice) of the seven variables; the remaining two (role ambiguity and role conflict) were negatively correlated (Meyer et al., 2002). These findings support the argument that organizations desiring to develop or improve affective commitment can do so by managing the work environment itself.

Of all the correlations between work experience variables and affective commitment reported by Meyer et al. (2002), perceived organizational support had the strongest positive correlation. This correlation was further extended by van Knippenberg and Sleebos (2006), who reported a significant relationship between perceived organizational support and commitment in their study of faculty members of a Dutch university. Perceived organizational support, based upon the central tenet

of social exchange theory that individuals reciprocate what they receive (Blau, 1964), reflects employees' beliefs regarding the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well being (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Allen, 1992). Specifically, employees who perceive that the organization values them reciprocate by developing a stronger emotional bond or affective commitment with the organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). The linkage between perceived organizational support and social exchange theory reaffirmed Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa's (1986) position that employees' affective commitment is influenced by their perception of how the organization demonstrates commitment to them by providing a supportive work environment.

Factors shown to increase perceived organizational support include supervisor support; fair treatment; rewards and working conditions such as pay, promotions, and job enrichment; recognition (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Eisenberger et al., 1986); formal positive feedback (Allen, 1995); frequency and sincerity of praise and approval (Blau, 1964), and support programs including work-family programs and those allowing employees to both receive and give support to others (Grant, Dutton, & Russo, 2008). The inferred relationship between communication and these factors supports Mathieu and Zajac's (1990) finding that communication was the strongest contextual antecedent reported. In their 2009 study on student organizational commitment, Forward, Daugherty, Michel, and Sandberg reported that perceived organizational support and communication positively correlated with organizational commitment, further solidifying this relationship. Furthermore, Forward et al. (2009)

argued for increased communication between students and faculty to increase commitment. Taken together, these findings warrant a closer examination of how communication facilitates perceived organizational support, which in turn may correlate with development of or strengthening of affective commitment.

Correlates of Organizational Commitment. Although common to all three components of commitment are the correlations with withdrawal cognition, turnover, and turnover intention (Meyer et al., 2002), Meyer and Allen (1991) noted that the consequences of organizational commitment extend beyond these specific behaviors. The existence of organizational effectiveness requires more than employees' desire to remain with the organization. What can add to organizational effectiveness is employees who desire to not only stay but are willing to perform their duties reliably and take initiative beyond their role requirements.

Beyond turnover and turnover intention, the behavioral outcomes of commitment vary based on the different mind-sets associated with each of the three components. It seems reasonable that affectively committed employees, those who want to be employed by the company, are more motivated to exert positive effort in carrying out their job duties and activities than those who feel obligated (normative commitment) or need to be employed (continuance commitment). In fact, in their summary of behavioral outcomes from multiple studies with diverse samples and various work performance indicators, Meyer and Allen (1997) argued that employees with strong affective commitment are more valuable to the organization than those with weak commitment. For example, affective commitment has been shown to be

significantly related to decreased absenteeism (Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorf, 1994; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Somers, 1995), various self-reported measures of work effort and job performance (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Randall, Fedor, & Longenecker, 1990), and supervisors' ratings of promotion potential (Meyer et al., 1989). Although positive relationships for these behaviors were reported for employees with normative commitment, the effects were weaker. However, the evidence indicates that employees with strong continuance commitment, those who believe the costs of leaving the organization are too great, are more likely to be poorer performers and less valuable to the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Behaviors other than in-role job performance have also been linked to organizational commitment. Organizational citizenship or extra-role behavior, work-related behavior that "goes above and beyond" one's job description, has been associated with affective commitment (Meyer et al., 1993; Shore & Wayne, 1993). Examples of extra-role behaviors include providing assistance to coworkers, volunteering for special organizational activities, and offering suggestions to resolve problems. Although weaker, normative commitment has also been positively linked to organizational citizenship; the results for continuance commitment have been mixed (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Meyer et al. (1993) reported that for workers who are dissatisfied with events at work, affective commitment was positively correlated with a willingness to offer suggestions for improvement and remain loyal. Further, affective commitment was negatively correlated with propensity toward withdrawal behavior including ignoring the situation.

The benefits of affective commitment are not limited to the employing organization. Affectively committed employees also benefit. Meyer et al. (2002) reported that stress and work-family conflict correlated negatively with affective commitment, whereas continuance commitment correlated positively with these factors. Schmidt (2007) reported that the intensity of burnout variables (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and high work stress) decreased with increased affective commitment.

Organizational Communication, Perceived Organizational Support, and Commitment. Workplace communication consists of messages *about* support such as employee benefits as well as messages *of* support such as expressions of concern or encouragement. Support messages occur in both informal and formal conversations, as well as through the behaviors of co-workers, immediate supervisors, and top management. Informal communication, defined here as voluntary conversation that is not directly related to accomplishing work-related tasks (Johnson, Donohue, Johnson, & Atkin, 1994), is recognized as a basic element of organizational life.

Either implicitly or explicitly, formal or informal, workplace messages convey meaning about the employee–organization relationship. Much research supports the positive association of both supervisor-subordinate and coworker relationship quality with increased organizational commitment (Sias, 2005; Morrison, 2004; Peterson, Puia, & Suess, 2003; Raabe & Beehr, 2003; Sias & Cahill, 1998). Allen (1992) reported a strong relationship between employees' perception of top management communication to both perceived organizational support and commitment. Through

its policies, for example, top management communicates the extent to which employees are valued or seen as easily replaced. Additionally, formal conversation with a supervisor during a performance evaluation provides an employee with information about how strongly he or she is valued by the organization. Results of two studies by Postmes, Tanis, and deWit (2001) reconfirmed Allen's findings by showing that communications with superiors (vertical communications) are more strongly related to organizational commitment than are horizontal communications with coworkers.

Providing opportunities for employees to *give* support to others has also been shown to increase affective organizational commitment. Giving time or money to an employee support fund to provide assistance to coworkers affected by Hurricane Katrina resulted in employees viewing their company as a caring organization that led to increased affective commitment (Grant, Dutton, & Russo, 2008). Informal communication among coworkers also presents opportunities to provide support and understanding of both personal and work-related problems of fellow employees as well as to foster a sense of inclusion.

The link between communication and affective commitment extends beyond perceived organizational support. Trombetta and Rogers (1988) reported that increasing job-related information and providing opportunities for employee participation in job-related decisions resulted in increased commitment. Quality of information, typically measured with regard to accuracy, timeliness, and usefulness (Allen, 1992, 1996), between coworkers and supervisors has been shown to be a

significant predictor of employee commitment (Sias, 2005). Coworkers are often a source for important organizational information not obtainable elsewhere (Sias, 2005).

Maintaining organizational commitment to their civilian organization may prove to be difficult for reservists deployed to support the war on terror. Unlike expatriates, who often have their families with them when they relocate overseas to perform a similar job for their same organization, reservists experience a myriad of changes. Reservists are separated from family and friends, employed by a different organization, and tasked to perform jobs associated with high stress and danger. Overall, the duties and work environment of their military role during deployment bear little resemblance to either their former civilian job or their reserve work environments. Reservists experience drastic changes in job responsibilities, diminished feelings of safety and security while working, and changes in their benefits and compensation.

As previously discussed, during overseas assignments both reservists (or expatriates) and their employing organizations experience change. Changes in personnel, policy, procedures, or product offerings may affect returning reservists' perception of and commitment to their civilian organization. Additionally, the trauma and stress associated with war experiences may have a transformative effect on post-deployed soldiers' values and perceptions. Returning reservists have reported difficulty with adjusting away from the intense cohesion and fellowship with their military unit to the culture of their civilian organization (Friedman, 2006).

As noted above, because of advances in communication technology, today's deployed soldiers, unlike soldiers during conflicts as recent as Vietnam, have access to affordable synchronous communications such as electronic mail, instant messaging, and affordable telephone service (Wong & Gerras, 2006). Deployed reservists are able to communicate with their families as well as coworkers and supervisors from their civilian organization. In this present study, particular interest is focused on an examination of who from the civilian workplace deployed reservists communicated with and the topics of their communication.

Given the correlation among communication with workplace colleagues, perceived organizational support, and affective commitment, an examination of who deployed reservists' communicated with, along with the topics and valence of their messages, address the following research questions:

RQ5: To what extent did message content and frequency of communication with civilian colleagues and non-deployed reserve members during reservists' deployment influence the differences in reported levels of affective, normative, and continuance commitment to their civilian and military organizations?

RQ6: To what extent do reservists' deployment experiences influence the differences in their perceived levels of affective, normative, and continuance commitment to their civilian and military organizations?

RQ7: To what extent do changes in the civilian workplace reported by post-deployed reservists influence the differences in their perceived levels of

affective, normative, and continuance commitment to their civilian organization?

Repatriation and Reintegration

Once they have deployed, military reservists and expatriates share a common attribute: both are citizens of one country who are working and living in another country. Although the nature of their overseas assignments is very different, similarities do exist between the two. Both experience some degree of culture shock (Black, Gregersen, & Mendenhall, 1992; Cox, 2004) upon arrival at their new assignment and again upon return to their home corporation. The return of corporate expatriates to their home country is known as repatriation, whereas the military refers to the soldier's return as reintegration. Given the overlap in adjustment difficulties experienced by expatriates and reservists, the literature on repatriation and reintegration is reviewed in the next section.

Repatriation. Increased globalization of business over the past several decades has resulted in corporate expansion to foreign markets. Given reports by iconic American corporations such as IBM, McDonalds, and Wal-Mart that revenues derived from their international operations reached over 55% of total revenues (Forbes, 2000), it is not surprising that more and more corporations have looked to foreign markets for expansion opportunities. One effect of this foreign expansion has been the increased need for expatriates to staff positions at these overseas locations. Expatriates, often high-potential employees (Allen & Alvarez, 1998), represent a sizable investment for the corporation. Black and Gregersen (1999) reported that

corporations spent anywhere from \$300,000 to \$1 million for each expatriate's salary, benefits, and cost-of-living adjustments; O'Conner (2002) reported expenditures upward of \$1-2 million per expatriate during a four-year period.

This phenomenon did not escape the attention of scholars. Over the last 20 years, scholars have generated a significant amount of research on the topic of expatriation (Hyder & Lovblad, 2007). Much of the initial scholarly attention has been focused on the expatriate's adjustment process to their new assignment rather than on the repatriation process at the end of the international assignment (Black, Gregersen, & Mendenhall, 1992; Hyder & Lovblad, 2007). Black et al. (1992) hypothesized that the difference in interest between the two was due to the expectation that repatriation should not be as difficult as expatriation because employees and their families were returning to a familiar environment, home. However, several scholars reported that adjusting to returning home was more problematic than adapting to a foreign culture (Adler, 1981; Allen & Alvarez, 1998; Black et al., 1992; Jassawalla, Connolly, & Slojkowski, 2004). Expatriates expected and therefore were better prepared to be challenged by the cross cultural differences between their home country and the country of assignment. However, they were less prepared for the return home. Changes to both the home country (e.g., social norms, economic conditions, technological advancements, and organizational culture) and the individual (e.g., beliefs, values, and attitudes) occurred during the expatriate's assignment, which was generally two to five years (Black et al., 1992). Facing these sudden, unanticipated changes upon their return may be one explanation why

expatriates reported greater difficulty with repatriation than expatriation (Black et al., 1992). These difficulties resulted in repatriation often being referred to as both “reverse culture shock” (Murray, 1973) and the final step in a circular process that began with the selection of the expatriate (Andreason & Kinneer, 2005).

One of the most frequently examined outcomes of poor repatriation is employee turnover. According to The Global Relocation Trends 2003/2004 Survey Report (GMAC, 2004), 13% of U.S. expatriates left their company within one year of their return, and an additional 10% left within two years. Baruch, Steele, and Quantrill (2002) reported turnover as high as 50% within the first few years of repatriation. Given the substantial financial investment associated with expatriates as previously discussed, these high rates of turnover led to scholarly interest in the repatriation process. Black et al.’s (1992) theoretical framework of repatriation adjustment consisted of 15 propositions concerning the two domains of adjustment: anticipatory adjustments that occur prior to returning home and adjustments that occur after relocating home. Furthermore, in their model Black et al. (1992) identified the following four factors thought to affect both domains of the repatriation process: (a) individual variables including attitudes, values, and characteristics of the expatriate; (b) job variables such as similarities in work duties between the domestic and international positions; (c) organizational variables including repatriation training, assigning a sponsor in the home office, and communication frequency between the expatriate and the home office; and (d) non-work variables involving the expatriate’s friends, family, cultural distance, and social status. MacDonald and

Arthur (2005) applied Black et al.'s (1992) model to address the career management aspect of repatriation. Hyder and Lovblad (2007) further extended the model by incorporating additional variables (individual motives for accepting an overseas assignment and the repatriation experience itself) and linking the elements of the repatriation process to retention. Jassawalla et al. (2004) proposed a simple model of effective repatriation that included strategies that managers should engage in prior to expatriates' departure, during their overseas assignments, and after their return. Unique to Jassawalla et al.'s model are outcomes for both the organization (improved retention and higher loyalty) and the employee (decreased uncertainty and anxiety, increased career satisfaction, and greater feelings of belonging to the organization).

Of particular interest to this study is the common element in all three models related to communication with expatriates during their assignments. Black et al. (1992) posited that with increased frequency and sharing of information between the expatriate and the home office, uncertainty would be reduced, thus resulting in successful repatriation. Hyder and Lovblad (2007) argued that giving and receiving information are both important elements of successful repatriation. Furthermore, through the communicative process, the support of the company becomes evident to the expatriate. Jassawalla et al. (2004) argued that the problems expatriates experience during foreign assignments are partly due to feelings of isolation and loss of connection with people and events in their home company. Managers who reported satisfactory repatriation experiences in their study cited the importance of communication with the organization as a whole while on their overseas assignment

(Jassawalla et al., 2004). An important implication for all repatriation models is the finding that newer types of communication technology such as electronic mail and the internet were reported by expatriates as equally or more satisfying than types of face-to-face communication (Cox, 2004).

Reintegration. Throughout history soldiers have been called to fight wars, both at home and abroad. The difficulties experienced by soldiers returning from these deployments, particularly those involving combat, have been well documented by scholars. Numerous studies have indicated that returning soldiers experience significant mental health issues such as posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and depression that require intervention (Friedman, 2006; Lapierre, Schwegler, & LaBauve, 2007; Lineberry, Bostwick, & Rundell, 2006; Milliken et al., 2007; Wheeler & Bragin, 2007), faced marital and family difficulties (Gambardella, 2008), and have negative attitudes toward the military that increased the likelihood that they would separate from the military (Hoge, Auchterlonie, & Milliken, 2006). Findings from this study showed returning reservists reported decreased levels of commitment to the military, which are associated with increased turnover.

Although today both active duty and reserve components are mobilized and deployed overseas, this has not always been the situation. After the Korean War and up until the Persian Gulf War, reserve components were rarely mobilized and deployed overseas (Lynch & Stover, 2008). The reserve component was considered a strategic reserve, or the nation's insurance policy, and "a deterrent force against the Soviet Union" (Lynch & Stover, 2008, p. 67), according to then Chief of the National

Guard Bureau, Lieutenant General Blum. Until the war on terror resulted in the inability of the Army to meet its world-wide commitments without them, reservists were not subject to the repetitive and lengthy deployments currently being experienced (Lynch & Stover, 2008).

These repetitive and lengthy deployments have created challenges for the civilian employers of deployed reservists. Unlike domestic corporations sending employees to staff positions in their overseas locations, employers of deployed reserve members have no control over the departure of their employees. Furthermore, the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA) mandates that activated reservists have the right to return to their pre-deployment jobs (Loughran, Klerman, & Savych, 2006), thus preventing employers from hiring permanent replacements for positions vacated due to these deployments. Instead, corporations are challenged to find temporary means to replace deployed soldiers or else face potential decreases in productivity (Loughran et al., 2006). Additionally, in a corporate climate driven by team cohesiveness, departure of a key employee for a year or more can lead to decreased team effectiveness (Daywalt & Herman, 2006).

The second challenge for civilian employers begins when demobilized soldiers return to their civilian employment. Although both active duty and reserve soldiers experience reintegration issues once demobilized, reserve members face difficulties during reintegration not experienced by their active duty counterparts. Returning to military bases, active duty soldiers have access to resources and support

networks found in military communities, and they work alongside soldiers who share their combat experiences.

Reservists, however, return to civilian communities often lacking reintegration support and resume their careers with colleagues who may lack understanding of their deployment experiences. Additionally, returning reservists report unique stressors including discrepancies between their civilian and military jobs and lack of support from their civilian employers (Stetz et al., 2007).

Both the U. S. Government and civilian organizations have responded to the need to assist employers and returning reservists with the reintegration process. In 2008, Congress recognized the need to assist returning reservists with reintegration and ordered the Secretary of Defense to establish the national Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program (YRRP) (National Defense Authorization Act of 2008). The YRRP provides information and services to National Guard and Reserve members from all military branches and their families throughout all phases of the deployment cycle. Reintegration activities are held monthly during the first 90 days following demobilization, and outreach services include employment assistance (National Defense Authorization Act, 2008). As part of the YRRP, the Center for Excellence in Reintegration was established to collect and analyze lessons learned, which are then used to develop the outreach services and programs (National Defense Authorization Act of 2008).

The Disability Management Employer Coalition, a nonprofit organization, organized a Workplace Warriors Think Tank in 2007 in order to identify strategies

for civilian employers that would aid the successful reintegration of employees (Carruthers & Harnett, 2008). Recommendations emerging from this think tank included encouraging employers to evaluate the effectiveness of their Employee Assistance Program (EAP) to assist returning citizen-soldiers, celebrating the employees' return to work, providing mentoring programs, maintaining communication during absences, and recapping changes during the employees' absence (Carruthers & Harnett, 2008). These recommendations were not based on surveys or focus groups with returning reservists; however, five of the thirteen think tank members had military experience including serving in Vietnam or Iraq (Carruthers & Harnett, 2008).

Recognizing that reintegrating reservists return to the workplace with improved leadership abilities and unique skills making them even more valuable employees (Carruthers & Harnett, 2008; Palmeri et al., 2004), numerous articles providing guidelines to organizations on how to assist reintegrating reservists have also appeared in trade publications. Drawing from two companies' experiences with returning soldiers, Rousmaniere (2009) summarizes that communication with the employee about company activities during deployment helps maintain feelings of connectedness and facilitates reintegration. Others report the importance of communication and strong support systems (Andrews, 2004; Liss, 2003; Warner, 2003).

As occurs when expatriates return from overseas assignments, communication about corporate changes and happenings during employees' absence may facilitate

successful reintegration and decrease the likelihood of turnover by fostering connectedness between deployed reservists and civilian employers. However, unlike the repatriation experience of expatriates, limited research has been conducted on the reintegration experience of the returning citizen-soldier. To advance the knowledge of the returning reservists' reintegration experience, this study uses open-ended questions to answer the following questions:

RQ8: What do post-deployed reservists propose that would have facilitated their reintegration to their civilian organization after deployment?

Conclusion

The review of literature on battlefield communication, organizational commitment, and repatriation and reintegration provides the context for this study. Additionally, this review has demonstrated the importance of communication to fostering morale of soldiers who are fighting our nation's wars. Further, organizational commitment was established in this review as important to both organizations and their employees. Finally, the challenges faced by employees returning to the workplace after lengthy absences were established.

In summary, this study, situated in the contemporary context of today's citizen-soldiers, examined the relationship of communication, deployment experiences, and organizational change on reintegrating reservists' organizational commitment.

CHAPTER THREE

Method

This Methods Chapter is divided in four subsections: research design, participants and data collection, instruments, and data analysis.

Research Design

To understand the relationships between communication of post-deployed reservists during their deployment and their post-deployment organizational commitment, a mixed methods approach was selected. The selection of this method is appropriate because combining the insights from both quantitative and qualitative data can result in a deeper understanding of the phenomenon (Benoit & Holbert, 2008). Additionally, Creswell (2009) posited that the use of multiple methods provides greater understanding of the complex issues addressed by social science research.

Results from a pilot study in which I interviewed citizen-soldiers provided context for this present study. Seven post-deployed citizen-soldiers who returned to their pre-deployment civilian position were asked about their communication during deployment and their reintegration experiences. All participants reported using e-mail while deployed to communicate with their civilian colleagues. Additionally, two reported occasional usage of instant messaging. Frequency of communication was reported as weekly to every three weeks depending on their mission and accessibility of technology. Four categories of messages with their civilian colleagues were

reported: (a) personnel and policy changes at the civilian organization, (b) support and encouragement for the deployed citizen-soldier, (c) personal lives of civilian coworkers, and (d) activities of the deployed citizen-soldier. All participants reported that communicating with their colleagues while deployed helped ease their return to the civilian organization. Participants in this pilot study acknowledged the importance of being recognized for their service upon return to the civilian organization. Finally, those exposed to combat reported more reintegration issues than those not exposed to combat.

The survey instrument used to collect data from participants in this current study included both closed-ended and open-ended questions. Quantitative methods were used to analyze closed-ended data; thematic analysis was used to analyze open-ended data.

Participants and Data Collection

The total sample for this study consisted of 106 current or former Army Reserve or Army National Guard members (94.3% male and 5.7% female) who have reintegrated from a deployment in support of our Middle East operations. Of the 106 participants, 93 reported deploying from 67 different Army Reserve and Army National Guard units; 13 participants did not disclose the unit deployed from or only reported the state where their unit is located. Participants ranged in age from 20 to 59 with the mean age of 39.08 ($SD = 9.36$). See table 1 for complete demographic characteristics of participants.

Lindsay (2005) described the difficulty in obtaining participants for survey research, yet this difficulty is seldom discussed in the methods section of scholarly articles. For this present study, recruiting participants proved to be challenging and time consuming. Given Lindsay's (2005) recommendation to report the process used to gain access with gatekeepers and participants in projects with difficult-to-reach samples, both the successful and unsuccessful methods used to recruit participants for this study are discussed.

Initially, the Director of the Center for Excellence in Reintegration, part of the Department of Defense's Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program (YRRP) established in 2008, agreed to assist with participant recruitment. However, after an eight-week period, the Director reported an inability to obtain cooperation from unit commanders in recruiting participants. In this era of heightened security and sensitivity of information, obtaining the assistance of gatekeepers, unit commanders in this specific study, proved to be insurmountable. Subsequently, a variety of other means were used to recruit participants for this study.

At the suggestion of the Army Research Institute, I called the Adjutant Generals office in Kansas asking for assistance with recruiting participants from Kansas Army National Guard and Reserve units. After reviewing detailed information about the study including the approval from the University of Kansas' Human Subjects Committee for the research project, the Adjutant General's representative, citing increased concerns about national security issues, declined to provide assistance.

Next, I sought assistance from an Army Reserve officer assigned to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. This officer secured approval from the commander of an Army Reserve unit in Maryville, Missouri, to include a request for volunteers to participate in this study in their monthly newsletter.

Next, the snowball technique, appropriate when the members of the target population are difficult to identify (Babbie, 2004), was used to recruit participants. I sent a message to 220 friends on Facebook explaining the research project and asking if they knew of any Army National Guard or Army Reserve members who had returned from deployment (see Appendix A). The message then asked readers if they would contact potential participants about completing the online survey. Readers were asked to send the military e-mail address of those who agreed to complete the survey. From this effort, the survey link was e-mailed to the military e-mail address of 22 potential participants. Included in this message was a request for readers to recruit additional participants from their units.

Additionally, other strategies using Facebook to recruit participants were employed. First, a message was sent through Facebook to 164 potential participants who self-identified membership in the Army National Guard or Army Reserve (see Appendix B). In the message, reservists were thanked for serving their country, provided with a description of the research project and characteristics of qualified participants, and asked to participate if appropriate. The survey link was included in the message. Although no response was required, 15 reservists replied stating they would complete the survey. Second, an internet search for news articles about Army

Guard and Reserve units returning home from deployment within the last six to eight months was conducted. Facebook was then searched for the profiles of specific soldiers named in the articles. If located, a message was sent to them asking for verification that they were the soldier referenced in the article and if so, then would they consider participating in the study (see Appendix C). Using this strategy, two commanders agreed to recruit participants, on a voluntary basis, from their respective units.

All participants, regardless of the specific strategy used to recruit them, were invited to voluntarily complete an online survey that took approximately 30 minutes to complete. Using the survey link, participants were first directed to a page with information about the study including the confidentiality of responses (see Appendix D). Additionally, participants were informed that they could withdraw from participation at any time by closing their browser window. No compensation, monetary or otherwise, was associated with this study.

The online survey (see Appendix E) completed by participants included demographic information; questions about the method, topics, and frequency of their communication during deployment with both civilian colleagues and non-deployed unit members; and questions about their deployment and reintegration experiences. The scale items measuring topics of communication during deployment were developed based upon results of my unpublished pilot study. To measure participants' perceptions of organizational commitment to their civilian organization and military unit, both pre- and post-deployment, they completed Meyer and Allen's affective,

normative, and continuance commitment scales. Instructions guided participants to think about their civilian organization or military unit either before they deployed or after returning from deployment.

Instruments

The online survey was constructed in order to collect data that measures both independent and dependent variables. Participants' reported post-deployment levels and the change between their reported pre- and post-deployment levels of affective, normative, and continuance commitment to both their civilian organization and military unit are the dependent variables. The independent variables are frequency, message topics, and channels of communication by relationship of the colleague to the post-deployed reservist; organizational change; and deployment experiences.

The dependent variables were measured using Meyer and Allen's (1997) affective, normative, and continuance commitment scales. To measure frequency and channels of communication, participants were asked to identify all channels of communication that they used during their deployment to communicate with colleagues from both their civilian and military organizations as well as the frequency of their communication. Message topic, perceptions of workplace changes, communication between the civilian organization and family members, and deployment experiences were assessed using five-point Likert scales. These instruments are described next.

Organizational commitment. Meyer and Allen's (1997) three scales, the Affective Commitment Scale (ACS), the Normative Commitment Scale (NCS), and

the Continuance Commitment Scale (CCS), were used to measure participants' perception of their pre- and post-deployment levels of organizational commitment to both their military and civilian organizations. The original commitment scales included eight items for each type of commitment, but they were shortened by Meyer and Allen to six items each (Fields, 2002). In an effort to improve response rates, the revised six-item scales were used in this study. Multisample confirmatory factor analysis has confirmed that each component of Meyer and Allen's multidimensional model comprises a separate dimension (Dunham et al.; Fields, 2002; Hackett et al., 1994; Meyer & Allen, 1996).

Although the primary focus of this study was affective commitment, given the multidimensionality of commitment, Meyer et al. (2002) argued that all three components of commitment must be measured simultaneously to examine the additive and interactive effects. For example, employees with high continuance commitment usually intend to remain at the organization, regardless of their affective commitment, because of the high costs associated with leaving. However, the reverse may not be true. An employee with low levels of continuance commitment would not necessarily leave unless accompanied by low levels of affective and normative commitment. Meyer et al. (2002) hypothesized that the modest correlations with behavior in many studies could be explained because of failure to analyze the interactions among the three components.

Therefore, participants responded to the six-item ACS, NCS, CCS for each organization (civilian and military unit) by time frame (pre-deployment and post-

deployment). This resulted in 18 scale items per organization per time frame or 36 scale items for each organization. Questions were grouped by the organization and time frame being measured. Additionally, instructions to participants and scale items were modified to continually remind participants of the organization and time frame being measured. For example, to measure perception of commitment prior to deployment, participants were instructed to select the response “that best represents your feelings about or attitude toward your civilian organization before you were deployed.” Similarly, to measure post-deployment commitment, participants were guided to “select the answer that best represents your feelings about or attitude toward your civilian organization after returning from deployment” to the same scale items, with modifications to reflect the appropriate time frame. Participants were then directed to respond to the same items about their Reserve or National Guard unit both pre- and post-deployment. Modifications to scale items included adding “prior to my deployment” and changing the word *organization* to *unit*.

Respondents answered the six items per each instrument on a 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*). Mean scores and standard deviations were calculated. Change in participants’ reported organizational commitment levels was computed in PASW Statistics 17.0 by first creating six new variables, one for each of the three levels of commitment for the two organizations. Next, the value for each variable was calculated by subtracting the pre-deployment mean from the respective post-deployment mean. Positive mean differences indicated increased post-deployment commitment levels, whereas negative mean differences indicated

decreased post-deployment commitment levels (see Tables 4 and 6). Details of each instrument follow.

Affective commitment scale (ACS). Participants' involvement in, emotional attachment to, and identification with their civilian and military organizations were measured using the ACS (Fields, 2002; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Sample items from the pre-deployment civilian organization ACS and the post-deployment military unit ACS included in this study are "Prior to my deployment I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization" and "Prior to my deployment, this unit had a great deal of personal meaning for me," respectively. Multiple studies have shown affective commitment to be the strongest independent predictor of employee turnover intentions (Jaros, 1997; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Somers, 1995).

The six items on the ACS were measured on a five-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*). Three of the items required reverse scoring (Fields, 2002). Fields (2002) reported coefficient alpha values for the ACS from multiple studies ranged from .77 to .88. Cronbach's alpha for this study's data indicated acceptable reliability for both organizations and time periods. Cronbach's alpha for the civilian organization before deployment = .87; for the civilian organization after deployment = .88; for the military organization before deployment = .87; and for the military organization after deployment, = .92.

Continuance commitment scale (CCS). Participants' commitment to organizations associated with the costs related to discontinuing employment or the necessity of continuing employment was measured using the CCS (Fields, 2002;

Meyer & Allen, 1991). Sample items from the post-deployment civilian CCS and the pre-deployment military CCS included in this study are “It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to” and “Before my deployment, too much in my life would have been disrupted if I had decided I wanted to leave the unit,” respectively.

The six items on the CCS were measured on a five-point Likert scale previously described. Fields (2002) reported that coefficient alpha values for the CCS from multiple studies varied from .69 to .84. Cronbach’s alpha for this study’s data indicated acceptable reliability for both organizations and time periods. Cronbach’s alpha for the civilian organization before deployment = .77; the civilian organization after deployment = .85; the military organization before deployment = .77; and the military organization after deployment = .85.

Normative commitment scale (NCS). Participants’ perceived obligation based upon cultural and organizational socialization experiences was assessed with the NCS (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Fields, 2002). Sample items from the post-deployment, civilian NCS and the pre-deployment NCS used in this study are “I would feel guilty if I left my organization now” and “Prior to my deployment, I felt my unit deserved my loyalty,” respectively.

As with the ACS and NCS, the six items on the ACS were measured on a five-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*). One item required reverse scoring (Fields, 2002). Coefficient alpha values from multiple studies ranged from .65 to .86 for the NCS (Fields, 2002). Cronbach’s alpha for this

study's data indicated acceptable reliability for both organizations and time periods. Cronbach's alpha for the civilian organization before deployment = .87; the civilian organization after deployment = .90; the military organization before deployment = .87; and the military organization after deployment = .91.

Communication during deployment. Participants were asked about their communication with colleagues from both their civilian and military organizations during deployment. Data collected included the channel, frequency, and topics of communication by relationship category using a variety of measures described below. Sample items are "Coworkers from my civilian company communicated with me regularly while I was deployed" and "In their messages, my civilian supervisors focused on telling me to take care of myself."

Relationship and channels of communication. Participants were asked to indicate all channels of communication used to communicate with colleagues by relationship categories (see Table 3). Relationships with civilian colleagues were categorized as co-workers, supervisors, and management (other than supervisor). Military colleagues were categorized as non-deployed peers and non-deployed leaders within participants' chain of command. Based on data collected in the previously mentioned pilot study, the channels listed were e-mail, telephone (landline), cellular phone, mail, video chat, text chat, and social networking sites. To ensure inclusiveness, channels of communication also included the options "did not communicate with anyone in this group" and "used other means to communicate."

Participants were asked to identify the other communication methods used to communicate if they selected the “used other channels” option.

Participants who reported that they had no communication with anyone from the three categories of civilian colleagues were advanced to the next survey topic, thereby skipping questions related to communication with civilian colleagues. This same procedure was used when measuring communication with military colleagues: participants who reported no communication with non-deployed peers and leaders from their military organization were advanced to the next survey topic.

Frequency of communication. Participants were asked to identify how frequently they communicated during their deployment with colleagues from each of the previously defined relationship categories (see Table 2). Frequency choices were categorized as never, almost daily, once weekly, several times monthly, monthly, and less often than monthly. Mean scores for frequency of communication by relationship category were calculated for participants who reported communication. Because of the sample size across categories, the frequency scale was collapsed into high communicators or low communicators. Using PASW Statistics 17.0, dummy variables were created to categorize participants as high or low communicators with each relationship category in the civilian and military organizations. Next, participants’ mean scores for each relationship category were compared to the overall mean score for the respective category. For each relationship, participants were identified as high or low based on whether their mean frequency score fell above or below the overall mean for the respective category.

Topics of communication. Findings from the previously mentioned pilot study were used to develop the taxonomy of topics. Topics of communication for each relationship category were measured using 13, five-point Likert scale items (1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*). Likert statements were developed to measure communication on the topics of colleagues' personal lives, work-related issues, support and encouragement, and activities of deployed reservists. Additionally, participants were asked about communication that occurred during their deployment between their civilian organization and their family members. Sample items from this section included "My co-workers were more interested in hearing what I was doing than in telling me about their activities," "In their messages, my supervisors focused on telling me to take care of myself," and "My family received company newsletters while I was deployed."

Changes to the civilian organization. Participants' perceptions about changes that took place in their civilian organization while they were deployed were assessed using ten, five-point Likert scale items (1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*). The specific areas of change assessed--personnel, policy, work place, and the job itself--were developed from the previously reported pilot study. Sample items included are "The civilian workplace I came back to was very different from the one I left" and "I felt as if I was included in changes or big news at work while I was deployed."

Reintegration to the civilian organization. Using the same five-point Likert scale, participants were asked to rate their satisfaction level with the recognition they

received for their military service during reintegration to their civilian organization. Three open-ended questions were also used to assess their satisfaction with reintegration process. The first, “How else would you have wanted your civilian employer to recognize you once you returned from deployment?” was used to identify the void between the civilian organization’s recognition of the citizen-soldiers’ service and the citizen-soldiers’ desired level of recognition. Questions two and three were “What, if anything, did your civilian organization do when you returned to work to help you adjust from soldier to civilian employee?” and “What else could they have done to help you with this transition?” Question two was designed to identify the reintegration assistance provided by participants’ civilian organizations when they returned to work. Question three was designed to gain an understanding of unmet support assistance that citizen-soldiers report as being beneficial during reintegration.

Of the 106 respondents, 71 (70%) reported that they worked either full- or part-time for a civilian organization in addition to their Army Reserve or Army National Guard part-time position. The number of responses to the three open-ended questions from the 71 who reported working for a civilian organization was 48 (68%), 55 (78%), and 50 (70%), respectively.

Deployment experiences. Two key factors separate the experience of the expatriate and the deployed reservists. First, deployed reservists who work full-time for a civilian company in addition to their military commitment are faced with many changes in their daily work environment once deployed. In addition to the changes in day-to-day work responsibilities, established work relationships, and compensation

and benefits, they must adjust to the organizational culture of the active-duty military. Second, they live and work under a state of constant vigilance for their safety and for the safety of their comrades. This section of the survey was designed to measure the relationships of these experiences on reintegration.

Participants in the pilot study reported five categories of deployment experiences as having an effect on their reintegration to their civilian organizations. Therefore, in this present study participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with nine Likert-statements related to these four categories of deployment experiences: (a) job responsibilities, (b) decision making, (c) financial difficulties, (d) continuation of benefits, and (e) combat exposure. Sample items include the following: “The job I performed while deployed was more important than my current civilian job” (job responsibilities), “ The potential consequences of the decisions I made while deployed were greater than those made in my civilian job” (decision making), “My family experienced financial difficulties because of my deployment” (financial difficulties), and “I was satisfied with the benefits my civilian organization continued to provide my family while I was deployed” (continuation of benefits). Additionally, participants reported their level of exposure to combat during deployment (see Table 8), specific military distinctions awarded such as the Purple Heart, and whether their unit experienced casualties.

Data Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative data were examined in this study. To answer research questions one through seven, quantitative data was collected. Qualitative

data was collected through three open-ended questions to address research question eight. Methods used to analyze all research questions are discussed next.

Various statistical procedures using PASW Statistics 17.0 were used to examine the quantitative data in this study. Frequencies and percentages of participants' responses by organizational relationship and frequency of communication for the civilian organization and military unit are reported to answer research question one, which asks to what extent post-deployed reservists report communication during deployment. Frequencies of channel usage to communicate during deployment with colleagues will be reported to answer research question two. Paired-samples *t*-tests were used to see if the differences between the mean pre- and post-deployment commitment scores were significant to answer research questions three (a) and four. To answer research question three (b), whether or not the changes in commitment levels for participants who reported separation from their civilian organization are significantly different from those who reported continued employment, independent-samples *t*-tests were used.

Research question five asks to what extent that message content and frequency of communication during deployment with civilian and military colleagues was related to the differences in reported commitment levels. Bivariate correlation analysis was used to determine if the independent variable, message content, was significantly correlated with the dependent variable measures, reported differences in pre- and post-commitment levels (see Appendix F). To determine the extent that frequency of communication (independent variable) was related to differences in

commitment levels (dependent variables), frequency of communication, because of the small sample sizes across the scale, was first collapsed into two groups labeled high and low communication. Participants' whose mean frequency score was above the overall mean frequency score were identified as high; those below the mean were identified as low. Independent *t*-tests were conducted to determine significance.

Bivariate correlation analysis was used to address research questions six and seven to determine if the independent variables (deployment experiences and changes in civilian organization) significantly correlated with the dependent variables (reported differences in pre- and post-deployment commitment levels) (see Appendices G and H). To assess the relationship of combat, one of the deployment experiences from research questions six, respondents were grouped into two categories, no combat and combat. Independent *t*-tests were conducted to determine significance.

Thematic analysis was used to understand and describe the responses to the three open-ended questions to address research question eight. First, responses to each question were read to become familiar with the data set. Responses were then re-read to grasp the overall meaning of the data. On the third reading, identical responses were highlighted and notes were made identifying the main idea of each participant's response. Next, themes were identified for each question following Owen's (1984) criteria of recurrence, repetition, and forcefulness.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

This purpose of this study is to examine the relationships between communication during deployment of post-deployed Army Reservists and Army National Guard members and the change between their pre- and post-deployment organizational commitment levels. Both message content and frequency of communication with coworkers and managers from their civilian and military organizations are examined. Relationships of this communication on post-deployed reservists' (a) differences in reported pre- and post-deployment affective, normative, and continuance commitment levels for both their civilian organization and their military unit and (b) reintegration experiences are examined. Finally, the relationship of reservists' deployment experiences and perceived changes to their civilian organizations on the three levels of commitment to both organizations are assessed.

Data screening, participant demographic information and results for each research question are presented in this chapter.

Data Screening

Prior to the main analysis, variables were analyzed through PASW Statistics 17.0 program for missing values and inconsistent responses. In the frequency and channels of communication measures, three items were revised to reflect participants' intended response: (a) one item for "used other means to communicate" with civilian coworkers using letters, cards, and mail was changed to "mail," (b) one item with

conflicting responses (“no communication with anyone in this group,” “communication by e-mail with civilian supervisor,” and “communication by mail with civilian supervisor”) was changed to reflect that “communication by mail” and “communication by e-mail” occurred with the civilian supervisor, and (c) one item with conflicting responses for communication with military leaders (“no communication with anyone in this group”) and the frequency of communication with military leaders (“less often than monthly”) was changed to reflect “never” in the frequency of communication. Three items with channels selected for civilian coworker and supervisor communication and one for military peers and leaders were detected as having missing values for frequency of communication with the respective groups. These items were included in the main analyses, which resulted in a difference between the reported numbers of participants communicating with civilian coworkers ($n = 66$), civilian supervisors ($n = 60$), military peers ($n = 85$), and military leaders ($n = 73$) and the corresponding reported number for frequency of communication with civilian coworkers ($n = 63$), civilian supervisors ($n = 57$), military peers ($n = 84$), and military leaders ($n = 72$).

Participant Demographics

Participants for this study were 106 Army Reserve or Army National Guard members who have returned from a deployment in support of the U. S. operations in the Middle East. Demographic information was collected from respondents regarding their sex, age, ethnicity, marital status during deployment, education, civilian employment, and military employment. The mean age of participants was 39.08

($SD = 9.36$), with a range of 20 years to 59 years; 94.3% were male and 5.7% were female. Regarding civilian employment status, 67% of the respondents reported full- or part-time employment with a civilian organization at the time of deployment, 21.7% reported full- or part-time employment with their Army Reserve or National Guard unit, and 11.3% reported they were unemployed other than their reserve commitment. Of those employed by a civilian organization at the time of deployment ($n = 71$), 19 (26.8%) reported they were no longer employed by that organization.

The demographic variables of the 106 participants are reported in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N=106)

Characteristic	n	%
Sex		
Male	100	94.3
Female	6	5.7
Age		
20-29	21	19.8
30-39	29	27.4
40-49	40	37.7
50-59	16	15.1
Ethnicity		
African-American	5	4.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	.9
Multi-racial/Mixed Race	2	1.9
Non-Hispanic White (Caucasian)	93	87.7
Spanish or Hispanic Origin	3	2.8
Other	2	1.9
Highest educational level completed		
High school or GED	4	3.8
Some college	29	27.4
Associates degree	13	12.3
Bachelors degree	27	25.5
Masters degree	16	15.1
Masters degree plus additional hours	17	16.0

Table 1 (continued)

Characteristic	n	%
Marital status at time of deployment		
Single	22	20.8
Married	72	67.9
Widowed	1	.9
Divorced	4	3.8
Separated	4	3.8
Other	3	2.8
Civilian job category		
Executive, manager, or supervisor	27	38.0
Non-supervisory, but not entry-level	30	42.3
Entry-level	8	11.3
Owner or sole proprietor	3	4.2
Other	3	4.2
Civilian industry		
Mining	1	1.4
Construction	4	5.6
Manufacturing	2	2.8
Retail trade	3	4.2
Transportation and warehousing	4	5.6
Information	2	2.8
Finance and insurance	3	4.2
Real estate	2	2.8
Professional, scientific, and technical services	12	16.9
Education	6	8.5
Health care and social assistance	6	8.5
Other services	4	5.6
Government – federal, state, or local	22	31.0
Time Employed, Civilian Position		
Less than 6 months	4	5.6
6 months to 1 year	7	9.9
1 to 4 years	16	22.5
5 to 9 years	24	33.8
10+ years	20	28.2
Military Rank		
E1 to E4 (Enlisted)	10	9.4
E5 to E9 (Enlisted)	45	42.5
CW3 to CW5 (Warrant Officers)	1	.9
O1 to O3 (Lieutenants, Captain)	17	16.0
O4 to O6 (Major, Lt. Colonel, Colonel)	33	31.1

Table 1 (continued)

Characteristic	n	%
Time Served, Military Position		
Less than 6 months	2	1.9
6 months to 1 year	1	.9
1 to 4 years	17	16.0
5 to 9 years	22	20.8
10+ years	64	60.4

Extent of Communication

Research question one asked to what extent post-deployed reservists reported communication during deployment with coworkers, supervisors, and managers from their civilian organization and with their non-deployed peers and leaders from their Army Reserve or National Guard unit. The results are presented by organization in the next section, and the reported frequencies of communication with military or civilian colleagues are reported in Table 2.

Communication with civilian colleagues. As previously reported in participant demographics, 67% ($n = 71$) of the respondents indicated employment with a civilian organization at the time of deployment. From this subgroup, the majority of respondents indicated that individuals from their civilian employer communicated with them during their deployment. Ninety-three percent reported communication from their civilian coworkers, and 84.5% reported communication from their civilian supervisors. Communication with members of management, other than their supervisor, was reported by 63.4% of respondents. In contrast, 7% of respondents indicated they had received no communication from their civilian coworkers during their deployment, and 15.5% reported no communication from their

civilian supervisors. No communication with members of management, other than their supervisor, during their deployment was reported by 36.6% of the respondents. Only three (4%) of participants reported not communicating with anyone from all three groups. When asked about the frequency of their communication with civilian colleagues, the frequencies identified most often for civilian coworkers, supervisors, and managers were monthly (35%), less often than monthly (46%), and less often than monthly (51%) respectively.

Communicating with military colleagues. Regarding communication with military colleagues, 80.2% ($N = 106$) reported communication from non-deployed peers from their military unit, and 68.9% reported communication from non-deployed leaders within their military unit's chain of command. In contrast, 19.8% reported no communication with non-deployed peers from their military unit, and 31.1% reported no communication with non-deployed leaders within their military unit chain of command. Nineteen (17.9%) participants reported not communicating with any of their non-deployed peers and leaders from their military unit. The frequencies of communication with non-deployed military peers and leaders reported most often were several times monthly for peers (30%) and less often than monthly for leaders (33%).

Channels of Communication.

To answer research question two, which asked what channels of communication reservists reported using to communicate during their deployment, participants were asked to indicate all channels they used to communicate with their

civilian coworkers, supervisors, managers, and non-deployed military peers and leaders. The data indicated that e-mail was used by more participants than any other communication channel to communicate across all categories of civilian and military colleagues; the telephone (landline) was the second most used channel.

Table 2

Frequency of Communication by Organization and Relationship

Frequency	Civilian ^a			Military ^b	
	Coworkers (<i>n</i> = 63)	Supervisors (<i>n</i> = 57)	Managers (<i>n</i> = 45)	Peers (<i>n</i> = 84)	Leaders (<i>n</i> = 72)
Almost daily	2 (.03)		2 (.04)	4 (.05)	3 (.04)
Once weekly	8 (.13)	4 (.07)		16 (.19)	6 (.08)
Several times monthly	16 (.25)	10 (.18)	7 (.16)	25 (.30)	19 (.27)
Monthly	22 (.35)	17 (.30)	13 (.29)	19 (.22)	20 (.28)
Less than monthly	15 (.24)	26 (.46)	23 (.51)	20 (.24)	24 (.33)

Note: Percentages in parenthesis represent percentage of those who reported communication by relationship category and frequency of communication.

^aParticipants who reported communicating with civilian colleagues. ^bParticipants who reported communicating with military colleagues.

Participants not only reported e-mail as being *used more* than other channels, but when asked to identify the method of communication they used *most frequently*

when communicating with civilian colleagues, 86.8% selected e-mail, and 90.8% said they used e-mail with military colleagues. The reported frequency of use for each communication channel by relationship category for both military and civilian organizations is presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Communication Channels Used by Organization and Relationship

Channel	Civilian ^a			Military ^b	
	Coworkers (<i>n</i> = 66)	Supervisors (<i>n</i> = 60)	Managers (<i>n</i> = 45)	Peers (<i>n</i> = 85)	Leaders (<i>n</i> = 73)
E-mail	65 (.99)	57 (.95)	43 (.96)	85 (100)	73 (100)
Telephone	22 (.33)	20 (.33)	11 (.24)	34 (.40)	26 (.36)
Cellular phone	7 (.11)	8 (.13)	2 (.04)	7 (.08)	6 (.08)
Mail	18 (.27)	12 (.20)	6 (.13)	8 (.10)	7 (.10)
Video chat	5 (.08)	2 (.03)	2 (.04)	6 (.07)	4 (.06)
Text chat	8 (.12)	6 (.10)	3 (.07)	5 (.06)	2 (.03)
Social networking	11 (.17)	5 (.08)	4 (.09)	15 (.18)	7 (.10)
Other	2 (.03) ^c	1 (.02) ^d	1 (.02) ^e		3 (.04) ^f

Note: Percentages in parenthesis represent percentage of those who reported communication by relationship category and channel of communication. Multiple responses permitted.

^aParticipants who reported communicating with civilian colleagues. ^bParticipants who reported communicating with military colleagues. ^cFace-to-face and web blog. ^dWeb blog. ^eWeb blog. ^fNot collected.

Organizational Commitment

Research questions three (a) and four asked if the differences between post-deployed reservists' reported pre- and post-deployment levels of affective, normative, and continuance commitment to their civilian and military work places are significant. Research question 3b asked if the differences in commitment levels are significant between post-deployed reservists reporting separation from their pre-deployment civilian employer and those reporting continued employment. Results are presented by organization.

Commitment to the civilian organization. To analyze whether significant differences existed between the pre- and post-deployment means of affective, normative, and continuance commitment to their civilian organization, paired samples *t* tests were conducted. Affective and normative commitment differences were statistically significant while continuance commitment differences were not. Participants' pre-deployment affective commitment ($M = 3.70$, $SD = .79$) was significantly higher than post-deployment affective commitment ($M = 3.28$, $SD = .95$), $t(70) = -4.662$, $p < .01$, $r = .49$. Participants' pre-deployment normative commitment ($M = 3.45$, $SD = .82$) was significantly higher than post-deployment normative commitment ($M = 3.13$, $SD = .98$), $t(70) = -3.337$, $p < .01$, $r = .37$. Although not statistically significant, participants' pre-deployment continuance commitment ($M = 2.93$, $SD = .76$) was lower than post-deployment continuance commitment ($M = 3.01$, $SD = .87$). The pre- and post-deployment means, mean

differences, and standard deviations for the three types of commitment to the civilian organization are reported in Table 4.

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Organizational Commitment to Civilian Organization

Variable	Post-deployment		Pre-deployment		Difference	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Affective commitment	3.28*	.95	3.70*	.79	-.42*	.76
Normative commitment	3.13*	.98	3.45*	.82	-.32*	.82
Continuance commitment	3.01	.87	2.93	.76	.08	.70

Note. *N* = 71.

**p* < .01.

Commitment differences between continued employment and separation. As previously stated, research question three (b) asked if a statistically significant difference existed in mean commitment scores between participants currently employed with the same civilian organization they had worked for prior to deployment and those who reported separation. Of the 71 respondents who held civilian positions at the time of deployment, 52 (73.2%) reported continued employment and 19 (26.8%) reported separation. Of the 19 (26.8%) who reported separation from the civilian company, seven (36.8%) reported that their position was

eliminated or they were laid off because of the economy, five (26.3%) reported voluntarily leaving because of changes in job satisfaction, two (10.5%) were offered early retirement, two (10.5%) were terminated, one (5.3%) moved, one (5.3%) left due to expiration of required licenses and certifications, and one (5.3%) took a full-time position with the military unit.

An independent t test was conducted to determine if the differences in mean commitment scores before and after deployment were statistically significantly different. Significant differences were determined for normative and continuance commitment while differences in affective commitment were not significant. Although the mean differences for post-deployment normative commitment, reflecting an obligation to stay, for both groups decreased, the decrease was greater and statistically significant for those who were no longer employed ($M = 2.61$, $SD = .82$) than those for still employed ($M = 3.32$, $SD = .76$), $t(69) = 2.132$, $p < .05$, $r = .25$. Mean differences were also significant for post-deployed continuance commitment, or the felt necessity of maintaining employment. For separated employees continuance commitment decreased ($M = 2.70$, $SD = .78$), while mean differences for those who continued employment increased ($M = 3.12$, $SD = .89$), $t(69) = 3.573$, $p < .01$, $r = .42$. Means, standard deviations and mean differences are reported in Table 5.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Organizational Commitment to Civilian Organization by Employment Status

Variable	Post-deployment		Pre-deployment		Difference	
	Emp. ^a	Sep. ^b	Emp.	Sep.	Emp.	Sep.
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Affective commitment	3.46 (.96)	2.79 (.75)	3.80 (.75)	3.42 (.84)	-.34 (.62)	-.63 (1.05)
Normative commitment	3.32 (.97)	2.61 (.82)	3.52 (.83)	3.23 (.78)	-.20 (.73)*	-.66 (.97)*
Continuance commitment	3.12 (.89)	2.70 (.78)	2.88 (.79)	3.08 (.65)	.24 (.58)**	-.38 (.81)**

Note. ^aEmp. = employed at civilian organization, $n = 52$. ^bSep. = separated from civilian organization, $n = 19$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Commitment to the military organization. To analyze whether significant differences existed between the pre- and post-deployment means of affective, normative, and continuance commitment to their Army Reserve or Army National Guard unit, paired samples t tests were conducted. For the military organizations, significant differences were found for mean scores in all three types of commitment. On average, participants' affective, normative, and continuance commitment levels were higher before deployment. Pre-deployment affective commitment ($M = 3.69$, $SD = .85$) was significantly higher than post-deployment affective commitment ($M = 3.31$, $SD = 1.02$), $t(105) = -4.04$, $p < .01$, $r = .43$. Participants' pre-deployment

normative commitment ($M = 3.61$, $SD = .85$) was significantly higher than post-deployment normative commitment ($M = 3.07$, $SD = 1.00$), $t(105) = -5.89$, $p < .01$, $r = .58$. Pre-deployment continuance commitment ($M = 2.72$, $SD = .73$) was significantly higher than post-deployment continuance commitment ($M = 2.52$, $SD = .83$), $t(105) = -2.90$, $p < .01$, $r = .32$. The pre- and post-deployment means, mean differences, and standard deviations for the three types of commitment to the civilian organization are reported in Table 6.

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations for Organizational Commitment to Military Organization

Variable	Post-deployment		Pre-deployment		Difference	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Affective commitment	3.31	1.02	3.69	.85	-.38*	.96
Normative commitment	3.07	1.00	3.61	.85	-.54*	.94
Continuance commitment	2.52	.83	2.72	.73	-.20*	.72

Note. $N = 105$.

* $p < .01$.

Frequency of Communication and Message Content

Research question five asked to what extent frequency of communication and message content with civilian colleagues and with non-deployed reserve members

during deployment influenced the differences in reported levels of affective, normative, and continuance commitment to both the reservists' civilian and military organizations. Results for frequency are presented first, followed by results for message content.

Frequency of communication. Participants reported frequency of communication by relationship type on a 6-point scale (1 = *never*, 2 = *almost daily*, 3 = *once weekly*, 4 = *several times monthly*, 5 = *monthly*, and 6 = *less often than monthly*). To assess the extent that frequency influenced commitment changes, mean frequency scores of those reporting communication were calculated in PASW Statistics 17.0 by removing participants responding *never*. Note that given the scale described above, once the participants responding *never* were removed, lower means are associated with more frequent communication.

To determine the extent frequency of communication influenced the differences in reported commitment levels, independent *t* tests were conducted for each organization. Using PASW Statistics 17.0 variables were created for the mean differences in pre- and post-deployment affective, normative, and continuance commitment scores. These variables were the test variables in the independent *t* tests for each organization. The grouping variable was one of the relationship categories, defined as high or low for the organization being measured. Participants who were identified as high communication or low communication for all relationships measured in the organization tested were included in the independent *t* tests. For the civilian organization, 14 participants were classified as high in all civilian relationship

categories and 11 were classified as low. For the military organization, 24 participants were identified as high in both relationship categories and 29 as low. Further analysis revealed that 17 of these participants were classified as either high or low for all relationship categories to both their military and civilian organizations. Mean scores for frequency and standard deviations of participants reporting communication with colleagues from either their military or civilian organizations are reported in Table 7.

Independent *t* tests revealed no significant relationships between the changes in affective, normative, and continuance commitment to both the civilian or military organizations and the frequency of communication. No significant differences were found for the mean difference of high communicators ($M = -.49$, $SD = 1.00$) and the mean difference of low communicators ($M = -.46$, $SD = .62$), $t(23) = -.097$, $p > .05$ on affective commitment to the civilian organization. No significant difference was found for the mean difference of high communicators ($M = -.54$, $SD = .83$) and the mean difference of low communicators ($M = -.23$, $SD = 1.34$), $t(23) = -.710$, $p > .05$ on normative commitment to the civilian organization. For continuance commitment, no significant difference was found for the mean difference of high communicators ($M = .30$, $SD = .77$) and the mean difference of low communicators ($M = .12$, $SD = .85$), $t(23) = .543$, $p > .05$.

For the military unit, no significant differences were identified for the mean difference of high communicators ($M = -.30$, $SD = .63$) and the mean difference of low communicators ($M = -.40$, $SD = 1.06$), $t(51) = .420$, $p > .05$ on affective commitment. No significant differences were found for the difference of high

communicators ($M = -.43$, $SD = .84$) and of low communicators ($M = -.51$, $SD = 1.12$), $t(51) = .272$, $p > .05$ on normative commitment. For continuance commitment, no significant differences were found for the mean difference of high communicators ($M = -.08$, $SD = .70$) and the mean difference of low communicators ($M = -.25$, $SD = .78$), $t(51) = .794$, $p > .05$.

Table 7

Frequency of Communication

Relationship category	Total			High			Low		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Civilian co-workers	4.63	1.08	63	3.50	.76	14	5.55	.52	11
Civilian supervisors	5.14	.95	57	4.29	.73	14	6.00	.00	11
Civilian managers - other than supervisor	5.22	1.02	45	4.29	.83	14	6.00	.00	11
Military peers	4.42	1.18	84	3.29	.69	24	5.45	.51	29
Military leaders	4.78	1.13	72	3.58	.65	24	5.66	.48	29

Note. Lower means are associated with more frequent communication.

Message content. Participants rated their level of agreement using the previously described scale on eight statements about the content of messages from their civilian coworkers and supervisors. An additional five statements asked about communication between the organization and reservists' family members. When

asked if messages from coworkers were focused on the writer's personal life, 25 (39%) disagreed or strongly disagreed; 40 (62%) disagreed or strongly disagreed for supervisors messages. When asked if messages were about work topics, 33 (51%) respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed for coworker messages and 28 (43%) disagreed or strongly disagreed for supervisors' messages. In contrast, when asked if civilian coworkers and supervisors were more interested in hearing about the reservists' activities, 42 (65%) responded they agreed or strongly agreed for coworker messages and 31 (48%) agreed or strongly agreed for supervisor messages.

Conversely, when asked if messages received from their civilian coworkers and supervisors were focused on providing support, 49 (75%) and 41 (63%) agreed or strongly agreed for coworker and supervisor messages, respectively. Participants also agreed or strongly agreed that the messages from coworkers and supervisors expressed interest in the deployed reservists' activities; 42 (65%) and 31 (48%), respectively.

Participants were asked about communication with family members about their civilian organization. Forty-six (70%) agreed or strongly agreed to the statement "during my deployment, I communicated with my family about my civilian organization." Responses to whether or not civilian colleagues communicated with family members were split; 28 (43%) responded they disagreed or strongly disagreed that civilian colleagues communicated with their family; 30 (46%) agreed or strongly agreed. However, when asked if family members received company newsletters or

were included in organizational activities, 42 (65%) disagreed or strongly disagreed about newsletters and 38 (59%) for organizational activities.

Bivariate correlation analysis was used to determine the extent that message content was related to the change in commitment levels. Only 5 of the 13 Likert statements measuring message content were found to be statistically significantly correlated with the differences in commitment to either the military or civilian organizations. Messages from civilian coworkers that expressed more interest in hearing about the deployed reservist and from those that focused on encouraging the reservist to be safe were significantly and negatively related to the differences in affective ($r = -.44$ and $r = -.32$, $p < .01$, respectively) and normative ($r = -.47$ and $r = -.38$, $p < .01$, respectively) commitment to the military unit. Additionally, the messages about being safe were significantly and negatively related to continuance ($r = -.29$, $p < .05$) commitment to the military unit. Messages from civilian supervisors about work topics and encouraging reservists to be safe were negatively and significantly related to the differences in continuance commitment to the military organization, $r = -.26$ and $r = -.25$, $p < .05$, respectively. Civilian supervisor messages encouraging reservists to be safe were also significantly and negatively associated with the change in normative ($r = -.26$, $p < .05$) commitment to the military. Participants' communication with family members about their civilian organization was found to be significantly and positively related to differences in civilian continuance commitment ($r = .31$, $p < .01$). Interestingly, no other significant correlations were found between message content and changes in commitment levels

to the civilian organization. The correlation matrix for all significant and insignificant correlations appears as Appendix F.

Deployment Experiences

To answer research question six that asked to what extent reservists' deployment experiences influenced changes in affective, normative, and continuance commitment to their military and civilian organizations, bivariate correlation analysis and independent *t* tests were used. All of the significant bivariate correlations found between changes in commitment and deployment experiences were to the military unit. Being satisfied with benefits provided by the civilian organization was significantly and negatively related with changes in affective ($r = -.24, p < .05$) and normative ($r = -.23, p < .05$) commitment to the military organization. More satisfaction with the military job versus the civilian job was significantly and positively correlated to affective ($r = .27, p < .01$), normative ($r = .27, p < .01$), and continuance ($r = .21, p < .05$) commitment to the military unit. The military job being viewed as more important than the civilian job by participants was significantly and positively correlated to affective ($r = .21, p < .05$), normative ($r = .30, p < .01$), and continuance ($r = .27, p < .01$) commitment to the military organization. A positive and significant relationship was also found between affective ($r = .21, p < .05$) and normative ($r = .22, p < .05$) commitment with the participant being viewed by military colleagues as a leader more than civilian colleagues. No significant relationships were found between consequences of decision making, family financial difficulties, or more responsibility in the military job and changes in the three levels

of commitment to the civilian and military organization. The correlation matrix with all variables of interest appears as Appendix G.

Independent *t* tests were conducted to determine the extent that combat exposure influenced changes in commitment. Respondents were split into two groups, those reporting combat exposure and those reporting not being exposed to combat. Combat exposure included being present during direct or indirect fire or engaging the enemy. Of the 106 participants, 86 (81%) reported combat exposure and 20 (19%) reported not being exposed to combat. From the subset of the 71 participants with a civilian job in addition to their military commitment, 54 (76%) reported combat exposure; 17 (24%) reported not being exposed to combat. Statistical significance was found between the changes in pre- and post-deployment affective and normative commitment means to the military organization for combat exposure. On average, the difference in mean commitment scores of participants exposed to combat ($M = -.48$, $SD = 1.01$) was related to decreased affective commitment to the military organization, whereas those who reported no combat exposure ($M = .08$, $SD = .47$), $t(104) = 3.66$, equal variances not assumed, $p < .05$, $r = .37$, experienced increased affective commitment. The mean changes in differences to normative commitment were also significant. Those exposed to combat ($M = -.61$, $SD = 1.00$) experienced greater decreases to normative commitment to the military organization than those not exposed to combat ($M = -.20$, $SD = .47$), $t(104) = 2.75$, equal variances not assumed, $p < .05$, $r = .27$. All mean differences and standard deviations are reported in Table 8.

Table 8

Combat Exposure and Mean Differences to Changes in Commitment

Variable	Exposed to Combat			No Combat Exposure		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Affective commitment, civilian	-.46	.84	54	-.28	.43	17
Normative commitment, civilian	-.35	.83	54	-.26	.80	17
Continuance commitment, civilian	.16	.63	54	-.19	.85	17
Affective commitment, military	-.48*	1.01	86	.08*	.48	20
Normative commitment, military	-.61*	1.00	86	-.20*	.47	20
Continuance commitment, military	-.23	.74	86	-.08	.62	20

* $p < .05$ **Changes to the Civilian Workplace**

Research question seven asked to what extent changes in the civilian workplace influence the difference in reservists' pre- and post-deployment commitment to their civilian organization. Bivariate correlation analysis was conducted to determine significant relationships. All but two of the variables, "The civilian workplace I came back to was very different from the one I left" and "I felt as if I was included in changes or big news at work while I was deployed," were significantly correlated with one or more of the differences in commitment. Intercorrelations of all variables related to changes in the civilian workplace are presented as Appendix H.

Reintegration to the Civilian Organization

Two methods were used to answer research question eight, which asked reservists what their civilian organization could do to facilitate reintegration once demobilized. First, reservists were asked to respond to the five-point scale item, “I was satisfied with recognition I received for my military service by my civilian organization when I returned to work after deployment.” The number of participants responding that they either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement was 36 (51%). Those responding that they either disagreed or strongly disagree equaled 17 (24%). The remaining 18 (25%) indicated that they neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. The mean score for satisfaction was 3.39 ($SD = 1.15$). Bivariate correlation analysis with commitment levels to the civilian organization resulted in significant relationships with changes in affective, $r = .37$, and changes in normative commitment, $r = .49$, $p < .01$.

Thematic analysis was used to identify the common themes from the three open-ended questions about the post-deployed reservists’ reintegration experiences. Responses to each question were analyzed by first reading all responses to become familiar with the data. The next step consisted of highlighting identical responses while reading for the main idea of each response. Once the main themes for all responses were coded, a broader analysis was conducted to identify themes.

For each of the open-ended questions, three common themes emerged:

(a) reservists did not want or need any additional support or recognition upon return to their civilian job, (b) support and acknowledgement of the reservists’ sacrifices and

service, and (c) support and assistance when resuming job duties. Results for each open-ended question are presented below using these three themes.

Additional recognition. When asked how else they would have wanted to be recognized by their civilian employer, 46 of the 71 participants who held both military and civilian jobs responded. Of this response, 28 (61%) responded that they were either satisfied with how they were recognized or that they did not want additional recognition. In the next largest group of responses, ten (22%) participants referenced having their service acknowledged by their civilian colleagues. Four participants mentioned that they would have appreciated being recognized by their CEO, supervisor, or leader. Six others mentioned that they would have appreciated being acknowledged for their service in an employee gathering or a lunch. Finally, the remaining eight (17%) comments were about the job itself. Not given enough time to adjust was mentioned by three participants, not receiving the appropriate pay for newly assigned duties, not being moved to another job, and not having medical benefits when first returning comprised the responses about the job. Two participants responded that they wish their civilian employer had not laid them off when they returned from deployment.

Adjustment help provided by the civilian organization. Participants were asked what assistance their civilian organization provided during their reintegration. A total of 53 comments were made from the 71 potential respondents. The most frequent response, 25 (47%), was that their civilian organization did nothing to provide them with adjustment help. In the theme focused around support and

acknowledgment, 15 (28%) participants responded. Being publicly recognized was reported by five, receiving counseling assistance by four, receiving encouragement and support from company personnel by three, being allowed a flexible schedule and days off by two, and being asked about the deployment experience by colleagues by one. Thirteen (25%) of the participants reported they received job-related support. Ten reported they received time to relearn their jobs, one reported attending the new employee briefing to be refreshed on benefits, one was allowed to job shadow while relearning the job, one was provided with a severance package.

Additional adjustment help desired. The final open-ended question asked post-deployed reservists what else their civilian employer could have done to help them in the reintegration process. Of the 45 responses to this question, the most frequent response, that no additional help was needed, was made by 26 (58%) participants. Additional support specific to the job was identified by 14 (31%). These included five comments about wanting their supervisor to sit down and provide them with a summary of changes made during their absence, three needing additional time to get up to speed, two wanting to be retrained, and one comment each for wanting a mentor, being paid for increased job responsibilities, wanting better work projects instead of the “leftovers,” and wanting the same work contract as they had prior to deployment. In the area of support, five (11%) areas were identified with one response each. Participants commented needing time off before returning to work, wanting to be welcomed and acknowledged for sacrifices made by the post-deployed

reservist, returning calls while deployed, writing letters during deployment, and understanding that the returning reservist had changed.

A discussion of these findings is presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of communication during military deployment on the post-deployed reservists' reported changes in affective, normative, and continuance commitment levels to their civilian and military organizations. Frequency of communication, channels used to communicate, and message content were examined. Additionally, the relationship of deployment experiences, changes in their civilian organization, and reintegration experiences on changes to commitment were also examined. Deployment experiences examined were participants' reported levels of exposure to combat, satisfaction with civilian benefits, and satisfaction with their military job while deployed. The overall findings of this study indicate that deployed reservists are communicating with civilian colleagues, supervisors, managers, and non-deployed military peers and leaders. They are communicating frequently using a variety of channels, but predominantly e-mail. With the exception of continuance commitment to the civilian organization, statistically significant decreases to all levels of commitment to both organizations were found.

Review of Findings

This chapter addresses the conclusions drawn from the findings, discusses the implications of these findings, outlines limitations of the study, and proposes directions for future research. For purposes of discussion, this chapter is divided into

three sections: communication during deployment of Army reservists, implications of communication, deployment experiences, and civilian workplace changes on Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of commitment, and the reintegration of returning soldiers to their civilian workplace.

Communication During Deployment. One of the main contributions of this study is that it adds to the limited information currently known about the extent of communication taking place during military deployment between soldiers and their civilian coworkers and non-deployed military colleagues. Research question one and research question two inquired about the extent of communication by deployed reservists and the channels used to communicate. Changes in technology from those available in earlier conflicts are pronounced. Ender and Segal in 1998 reported in their study of the communication media used by soldiers deployed to Somalia that 82.1% ($N = 366$) of the soldiers hardly ever used e-mail. Schumm et al. (2004) reported that e-mail was never used by 61.8% ($N = 524$) of soldiers when communicating with home while on a peacekeeping mission in the Sinai in 1995. Although these two studies focused on soldiers' communication with family members while deployed, they provide a frame of reference to understand the rapid growth in technological advancements in communication. This growth in e-mail usage by soldiers is quite pronounced when considering the results of the present study. Almost 100% of the participants in this study reported using e-mail to communicate with civilian and military colleagues. Not only did almost all participants report using

e-mail, but they also reported e-mail as the most frequently used channel to communicate with colleagues.

Frequency of communication. In addition to understanding the communication channels used by deployed reservists, this study also extends our knowledge about how frequently these soldiers communicated with civilian coworkers, supervisors, managers, and non-deployed military peers and leaders. Schumm et al. (2004) reported that 13.8% of the soldiers' communicated one to three times monthly across all communication channels; 9% communicated on average once weekly. For this study, 51% of the participants' reported communicating several times monthly to monthly with civilian coworkers, supervisors, and managers and 53% with military colleagues at home. Weekly communication was reported by 10% with civilian colleagues and 13% with military colleagues. These comparisons indicate that today's reservists are communicating more frequently with civilian and non-deployed military colleagues than did the previous generation of deployed soldiers with their family members. Given this, it is evident that today's deployed reservists use communication technologies to maintain relationships.

Another aspect of communication examined was message content. Overwhelmingly, reservists agreed or strongly agreed that the messages received from their civilian coworkers were focused on providing support (75%) and expressing interest in the deployed reservists' activities (65%). In contrast, only 23% of respondents indicated coworker messages were about work topics, and 45% reported the messages were about their coworkers' personal lives. A similar

dichotomy was reported about messages from supervisors. The majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that supervisor messages were focused on providing support (63%) and expressing interest in the deployed reservists' activities (48%). Only 26% of participants reported supervisors' messages were about work topics and 12% agreed or strongly agreed that the messages were about their supervisors' personal lives.

What is clear from this data is that coworkers and supervisors provided messages of support for the deployed reservist. While coworkers and supervisors use this informal communication to give support to their deployed colleague, these messages of support may have a secondary benefit. As argued by Grant et al. (2008), acts of supporting coworkers can result in increased affective commitment to the organization of those employees providing the support. During the process of supporting their deployed coworker, employees may be fostering a stronger bond between one another and with the organization itself.

Communication scholars have argued against the early viewpoint of computer-mediated communication (CMC) as a less "rich" medium, one that resulted in diminished communication satisfaction (Haythornthwaite, 2005). This early viewpoint of CMC was based upon media richness theory, which posited that media with multiple cues – tone of voice, nonverbal cues, and facial expressions – were "richer" and more effective for transmitting information (Daft & Lengel, 1986; Daft, Lengel, & Trevino, 1987). "Lean" media, those with few cues, were identified as inappropriate for interpersonal communication (Daft & Lengel, 1986). Similarly,

social presence, which represents the degree of salience or awareness of another person, has been associated with the communication channel (Short, Williams, & Christie, 1976). Both theories argued that the decreased cues in CMC resulted in decreased awareness and sensitivity and subsequently resulted in impersonal exchanges. Recently, using the context of online classes, scholars have argued that presence can be established through sharing of ideas, encouraging others, and clarifying questions, thereby reducing ambiguity (LaRose & Whitten, 2000; Russo & Benson, 2005). Support for computer-mediated social support was also reported by Turner, Grube, and Meyers (2001).

During their deployments to the Middle East, reservists have been faced with many dangers. News reports are far too frequent of roadside bombs, snipers, and suicide bombings that injure or fatally wound U. S. soldiers. In such an intense work environment, frequent communication with messages of support from their civilian and non-deployed military colleagues reflects the reservists' need to stay connected with. Equally, as Baym (2009) and Wellman and Haythornthwaite (2002) argued, it reflects the integration of human communication and technology in our daily lives. This communication also blurs the boundary, which prior to deployment was perhaps clearer, between the reservists' civilian position and their military job. Prior to deployment, citizen-soldiers reported for military duty one weekend monthly and for training two weeks annually. For reservists working the typical Monday through Friday schedule in civilian jobs, weekend drills are not taking time away from their civilian job. Absence for two weeks annually to perform training is similar to taking a

vacation from their civilian job. These short-term participation in military activities makes it easier for reservists to draw clear lines of distinction between their civilian and military positions. However, during lengthy deployments the boundary between the role of citizen and the role of soldier is not as clear, given the amount of communication taking place with civilian colleagues.

Organizational Commitment. Organizational commitment was measured multiple times in this study to answer research questions three and four. Pre- and post-deployment affective, normative, and continuance commitment to participants' civilian organization and military unit were measured. Additionally, to address research question 3b, commitment measures for the civilian organization were subdivided into two groups based on employment status. One group consisted of reservists who reported continued employment with their civilian organization; the other group consisted of those who reported separation. Consistent with the meta-analysis conducted by Meyer et al. (2002), affective and normative commitment were highly correlated (r ranging from .67 to .87) for every time period and both organizations. The correlation between affective and normative commitment in this study adds to the literature reporting strong links between these two components of commitment.

One of the main areas of investigation in this study was the relationship of communication, deployment experiences, and changes in the civilian workplace on organizational commitment. Although much research has been conducted on organizational commitment, this study is one of the first to examine the construct in

the specific context of the deployed citizen-soldier. Somewhat surprisingly, all but one level of post-deployment affective, normative, and continuance commitment to both the military and civilian organizations resulted in statistically significant decreases. The only exception, continuance commitment to the civilian organization, increased, but the increase was not statistically significant (Table 4).

However, when separating the commitment scores of employees who reported no longer being employed by their pre-deployment civilian organization from those who remained employed, several changes were noted (Table 5). First, for the 52 participants still employed by their civilian company, although affective and normative commitment levels still decreased, the amount of the decrease was less than that for the total group. Additionally, this decrease resulted in affective commitment no longer being statistically significant for this group; the decrease in normative commitment remained statistically significant. Second, continuance commitment increased by a greater amount, and the increase was statistically significant. Changes were also noted in commitment levels of the 19 participants no longer employed by their pre-deployment civilian company. First, all of the commitment levels decreased by a greater amount as compared to the entire group (Table 5). However, the decrease in affective commitment was no longer significant, while the decrease in normative commitment remained significant. Second, the difference in continuance commitment for this subset versus all participants who worked for a civilian organization was quite different. Instead of a small, insignificant increase to continuance commitment, it was now a statistically significant decrease.

Analyzing the changes in commitment levels of these two groups separately makes sense. Of the 19 participants who reported no longer working for the civilian organization, 17 left under negative circumstances. Three participants indicated that they were either laid off when they returned from deployment or that they never returned to the company. The remaining fourteen, citing economic changes or job satisfaction issues as the reason they were no longer employed by their civilian company, did not indicate when their employment terminated. Regardless, it is not surprising that their commitment scores reflected greater decreases than those who remained employed. Being terminated, laid off, or forced to retire from one's position would likely have a negative influence on perceptions of commitment.

What is most intriguing when considering the changes in pre- and post-deployment commitment levels of participants still employed, is the change in affective commitment. Previously, with both groups reported together, affective commitment showed a significant decrease. Now, with only those still employed, the amount of the decrease in affective commitment is less and the decrease is no longer statistically significant.

Of the three components of commitment, affective commitment is most aligned with this studies' investigation, however, following Meyer & Allen's (1997, 1991) recommendation all three components were measured. Although affective commitment decreased in all analyses, the statistically insignificant decrease associated with the participants still employed with their company gives rise to the question of the degree to which communication with colleagues is related to

minimizing the decrease or maintaining the pre-deployment levels. Future research should address this issue.

When considering the changes to pre- and post-deployment commitment to the military organization, it may not be surprising that all components of commitment to participants' reserve unit showed statistically significant decreases. Because decreased commitment is associated with turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1990), the decline in reservists' post-deployed commitment may lead to decreased soldier retention. Given the emerging demands placed on reserve units since the events of 9/11, soldier retention has increasingly become a concern for military leaders (Griffith, 2009).

In a review of organizational commitment in the military, Allen (2003) called for a continued focus on construct validation in the context of the military culture. The findings in this study support Allen's position. Although participants reported decreased levels of post-deployment commitment to the military organization, 64 (60%) responded they strongly disagreed or disagreed that they felt less commitment to their military unit after deployment. An additional 18 (17%) responded that they neither agreed nor disagreed; only (24) 23% responded they agreed or strongly agreed to feeling less commitment. With 77% of the respondents in this study reporting that they strongly disagreed, disagreed, or were neutral about feeling less committed, it does raise questions about the validity of Meyer and Allen's (1991) commitment scales in the military context.

Communication and organizational commitment. Although post-deployed reservists reported communicating during deployment with colleagues from both their civilian employer and reserve unit, frequency of communication, and with a few exceptions, message content did not relate to changes in commitment. This in itself was surprising, but even more unexpected was the relationship found between messages of support from civilian colleagues and levels of commitment. Support messages from coworkers and supervisors that encouraged the reservists to take care and be safe were significantly and negatively related to two or more levels of military commitment. Therefore, responses that indicated strong agreement that coworker and supervisor messages encouraged them to be safe were associated with decreases in military commitment. Messages from coworkers that were focused on wanting to know about the reservists' activities also correlated negatively and significantly with affective and normative commitment to the military unit. As before, responses with strong agreement that in their messages coworkers wanted to know about the reservists' activities were related to decreases in military commitment. None of these message types were related to changes in commitment to the civilian organization.

At first, the relationships between these messages and commitment appear puzzling. How is it that messages intended to show support and encouragement as well as demonstrate interest in the reservists' activities be related to decreased commitment? One possible explanation is that communicating with civilian colleagues represents a distraction or an escape from the dangers and intensity of their work environment. Reservists' relationships with civilian colleagues are a shared

reality of the civilian workplace environment, one that is not associated with the military mission. Therefore, when civilian colleagues express concerns and show interest in reservists' activities in messages, reservists are reminded of the dangers and horrors of their current situation. Unable to escape from this reality, even for a short time, by communicating with civilian coworkers could lead to decreased commitment. In 2003, Allen posited that a lack of information exists on the relationship between commitment and behavior under stressful conditions. This data suggests that reservists who work and live in stressful conditions for lengthy periods of time may not report the desire, the need, or the obligation to remain a citizen-soldier.

Deployment experiences and organizational commitment. Research question six asked the extent to which deployment experiences were related to changes in commitment. Two categories of deployment experiences and their relationship to commitment were considered in this study.

First, participants exposed to combat experienced significant decreases in affective and normative commitment to the military. Multiple studies have reported on the negative relationship of deployment stressors, including combat exposure, of soldiers returning from Iraq and Afghanistan (LaBash, Vogt, King, & King, 2009; LaPierre et al., 2007; Renshaw, Rodrigues, & Jones, 2009). In 2007, Wheeler and Bragin reported that almost half of the National Guard soldiers returning from deployment reported psychological symptoms of distress. Given this, decreased organizational commitment to the military as a result of combat exposure appears

intuitive. Engaging in combat that results in wounding or taking the life of another, watching fellow soldiers be severely injured or killed, or facing the many horrors associated with war, could create a tension between the soldiers' belief in, support of, and commitment to the military mission and the soldiers' personal values. This tension and conflicting value system could account for the reported decreased commitment to the military unit and large number of soldiers' reporting psychological distress. More importantly, when comparing organizational commitment to psychological distress, decreased commitment levels of commitment appear insignificant.

The second category of deployment experiences dealt primarily with characteristics of the military job. For reservists who reported having civilian positions in addition to their military job, a consistent pattern of rating their military job as more salient than their civilian job was found. A positive statistically significant relationship was associated with commitment to the military organization for reservists who reported greater satisfaction with their military job than their civilian job, that their military job was more important than their civilian one, and that their military, more than their civilian, colleagues viewed them as a leader. Although these same dimensions were not statistically significant for changes in commitment to the civilian organization, several approached negative significance. These self-reported evaluations of reservists' military jobs indicate increased job satisfaction and involvement and are associated with increased commitment to the military organization.

Meyer et al. (2002) identified job satisfaction, job involvement, and occupational commitment as correlates of commitment. Additionally, Meyer et al. (2002) reported strong correlations between affective commitment and all three variables with the strongest correlation to overall job satisfaction. Although this study compared satisfaction between two jobs, the finding of greater satisfaction with the military job as having a medium effect ($r = .27$) on affective commitment, provides further support for job satisfaction as a correlate to affective commitment. Further studies identifying the tasks or job components contributing to soldiers' job satisfaction would help military leaders identify strategies to foster affective commitment.

When considering the relationship of both dimensions of deployment experiences to changes in commitment, additional questions are warranted. How is it that exposure to combat is associated with decreases in commitment, while characteristics of the job are associated with increases in commitment? Is it possible for reservists to simultaneously view their military job as more important and satisfying than their civilian job and engage in combat? Or, are these viewpoints mutually exclusive? Understanding the interaction of these findings may be warranted in future studies.

Civilian workplace changes and organizational commitment. One of the findings of this study was that topics of communication between civilian coworkers and supervisors were more supportive in nature than about work-related issues. Given the infrequency of reported conversations about work topics, reservists' seemingly

return to their civilian organization and are faced with adjusting to a changed organization. Research question seven explored the relationship between perceived changes in the civilian organization and changes to organization commitment. All but two of the nine bivariate correlations measuring association of changes in the organizational to changes in commitment were statistically significant to one or more levels of commitment. In all correlations, the scores reflecting more change resulted in decreases to commitment.

Findings for this question are conflicting. Results show that reservists communicate regularly with civilian coworkers, but only 15 (23%) participants report communicating with coworkers about work topics and only 17 (26%) reported communicating about work topics with their supervisors. Furthermore, 49 (69%) reservists' reported they disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement "While deployed I was not interested in what was happening at my civilian organization." Conversely, 15 (21%) responded they agreed or strongly agreed with this statement; 7 (10%) neither agreed nor disagreed. Why then, given the opportunity to send and receive messages about organizational issues and changes, are a minority of participants communicating about the organization with coworkers? One possible explanation to this question relates to the work environment of the deployed reservist. Returning soldiers have reported repeated exposure to injury to both themselves and other soldiers (Gutierrez & Brenner, 2009), seeing injured or ill women and children whom they could not help (Lineberry, et al., 2006), combat exposure (Renshaw et al., 2009), and difficult, intense living conditions (LaBash et al., 2009). Although

interested in activities at the civilian organization, to maintain focus and survive the emotional intensity and stress of daily life during their deployment, reservists may not be able to cope with the added stress associated organizational change. From the reservists' perspective, the physical and mental demands of surviving their daily activities during deployment are draining. Changes to policies, operating procedures, budgets, and work assignments at their civilian organization may appear trivial as compared to reservists' daily struggle with survival. Because of this when returning to their civilian job after deployment, they are faced with adapting to a changed organization. It is not unexpected then, that the number of changes and magnitude of their outcomes could adversely affect organizational commitment.

Reintegration to the Civilian Workplace. One Likert scale item and three open-ended questions were used to understand the reintegration experiences of returning citizen-soldiers. Whether the question was about being recognized, the adjustment assistance provided to them by their civilian organization, or additional assistance they would have found helpful, three themes were common to all.

The first theme addressed the recognition the reservists received when they returned to their civilian organization. The majority of respondents indicated they were satisfied with the recognition or that they did not want to be recognized for their service. From this, it appears that civilian organizations are welcoming their returning citizen-soldiers with some type of ceremony or event. One response in particular captures the essence of those who felt they received adequate recognition for their

service, “Nothing more. I felt my service to our country was my own doing and to expect more recognition to do my part for our nation would be self-rewarding.”

Still, some soldiers expressed not being satisfied with the recognition they received upon their return. Four participants specifically mentioned wanting their return and service acknowledged by the company CEO, leader, or supervisor. These comments support the findings by several scholars of the importance of supervisor and top management’s support to perceived organizational support and commitment (Allen, 1992; Postmes et al., 2001). For example, “A letter of appreciation from the over-all supervisor (the Mayor of the City) or at least a phone call would be nice.”

Two other participants’ comments reflected frustration at not being recognized at all or being recognized only if it was beneficial for the company. At not being recognized the participant responded, “To have acknowledged my service at all. Nobody has once ever said anything to me about [it]. Not a thank you, not asking about it, or anything.” And finally, from another who was dissatisfied:

Management would only acknowledge my service when we were with clients and only if it was beneficial to the organization to recognize my service. I wanted my service to be recognized in personal interactions with my supervisor. Instead, I got the sense that they would prefer to not talk about it and move on. Co-workers were much more interested and kind to me.

Given the relationship between satisfaction with the recognition received and both affective ($r = .37, p < .01$) and normative ($r = .49, p < .01$) commitment to the civilian organization, civilian employers need to recognize their returning citizen-soldiers. Whether recognition is in a public forum such as a company-wide meeting or a one-

on-one conversation with the CEO, the significance of communication in this process is clear.

The second theme addresses the non-job specific adjustment support needs of returning citizen-soldiers. Surprisingly, 25 (47%) participants replied that they did not receive any adjustment help from their organization when they returned from deployment. Typical responses were “Nothing,” “Nothing at all,” and “Absolutely nothing.” Another response stood out from others, “NO HELP PROVIDED” (caps in the original). And another who planned for their own readjustment replied:

Nothing. In fact, I took 3 weeks off before returning to work to get readjusted and they were upset that I did not return right away. When I returned, my office had been moved and it wasn't ready for me to move into.

One participant seemed to be trying to make sense of the lack of assistance by associating it to changes with the comment “There's been nothing. Hardly any communication at all. I don't know if this is due to all the employee and supervisor position changes or what.”

One participant described a completely different experience with the assistance received:

They allowed me as much time off as I wanted, they gave me much-needed space, they allowed me to slowly transition back into work, they gave me no requirements or duties immediately, and they allowed me to adjust. A year and a half later, they are still giving me some room to adjust. The leadership and staff at this organization are incredibly supportive.

Others reported received counseling assistance, encouragement, flexible schedules to accommodate medical appointments, and the time needed to adjust.

The contrast between the participants who described various means in which they were assisted during reintegration by their organizations and those who indicated no assistance is remarkable. As with the first theme, the importance of communication is clear. The ability to talk about the deployment experience, in essence to tell their story, when the reservist returns, is an important step in the reintegration process.

The third theme that emerged was assistance that was job-specific. The need for time to retrain, relearn, and “get up to speed” on job duties and responsibilities was mentioned by 13 reservists. One commented that “perhaps an extensive sit down with me outling [sic] new polices [sic], regular procedures and meet new employees. I was pretty much left to fend for myself and ask continual and routine questions.” Another participant expressed needing help by responding “Just talk to me! Help me get reliscensed [sic] in things I need to. Help me get back up to speed and on the same page. It’s all been on me to do everything.” Yet, others reported receiving job assistance such as being allowed to job shadow, being assigned a mentor, and receiving time to transition before resuming responsibilities. As with the first two themes, inherent to providing reintegration assistance to returning citizen-soldiers is communication.

Summary

Taken in its entirety, these results indicate that communication during military deployments supporting Middle East operations is important for Army Reservists and Army National Guard members. Although results are mixed for the relationship of

communication about changes to the citizen-soldiers' pre- and post-deployment affective, normative, and continuance commitment levels to their civilian organization and military unit, the importance of communication is clear. During deployment, supportive communication from civilian colleagues may help the deployed soldier cope with their situation and maintain organizational relationships. Maintaining these relationships may prevent even greater decreases in commitment. When reintegrating to their civilian organization, communication is a vital element in the adjustment process. This study suggests that recognizing returning reservists as they reintegrate, communicating with them about organizational changes, offering messages of support and encouragement, and providing transition assistance are all important components of successful reintegration.

Implications

Theoretical implications. This study adds to the literature by examining commitment in the military context. Allen (2003) suggested that additional research on commitment in the military context was critical for both benchmarking purposes and construct validation. This study also contributes by examining commitment in high intensity, stressful situations, which according to Allen (2003) little is known about the relationship between behavior and commitment. Additionally, it contributes to the discussion of commitment to multiple foci by examining the unique situation of the deployed reservist. The results of this study indicate that reservists are committed to two, often diverse, organizations. Furthermore, and perhaps more importantly, commitment to each organization is not compartmentalized. Instead, the results of

this study indicate the intersection and overlap of commitment. Activities and changes in one organization can subsequently affect the commitment to one or both organizations.

This study also contributes to the literature on the use of communication media to provide social support and maintain relationships during extended periods of separation from family and friends. Prior studies (Ender & Segal, 1998; Schumm et al., 2004) reported that soldiers communicated with family members during military deployments. Results of this present study extend the findings about communication during deployment by providing evidence that reservists communicate with their civilian colleagues, not just family members.

Participants in this study reported using multiple forms of media from social networking sites, the telephone, to text messaging, to communicate messages of support. However, e-mail communication was reported as being used most often and more frequently than other forms of media. The findings from this study add to the growing body of literature that provides support for CMC being appropriate for relational communication (Baym, 2000; Cox, 2004; Walther, 1996; Wright, 2004).

Finally, the results of this study extend the argument that the ability to communicate using the internet has become integrated into everyday life. When deployed reservists communicated with their civilian peers, supervisors, managers, non-deployed military peers and leaders, they demonstrated today's networked society. Wellman and Haythornthwaite (2002) argued that in the networked society, the traditional boundaries are diminished and members function simultaneously or

freely move between groups. For the deployed reservists, the boundaries between soldier and civilian employee became porous as they maintained their organizational relationships.

Practical implications. In addition to the theoretical implications, the finding from this study has practical implications. Whether the conflicts in the Middle East continue for several more years or even a decade, reservists will be called upon to assist the all-volunteer active duty components fulfill their mission. They will continue to be deployed more frequently than in prior conflicts and for longer periods of times. Civilian organizations must continue to create support systems to help the deploying citizen-soldiers before, during, and after deployment.

Organizations need to communicate the changes, if any, to the deploying citizen-soldier's company benefits and seniority. Coworkers, supervisors, and managers need to maintain consistent communication with deployed reservists. While no significant increases in commitment levels were associated with messages from civilian colleagues during the deployment, it is not clear what the absence of those messages would have been. Perhaps maintaining pre-deployment commitment levels or minimizing the decrease is a positive outcome given the working and living conditions endured by deployed reservists. What is clear from these findings is the importance of recognizing citizen-soldiers during their reintegration. It also appears important for supervisors, managers, and company leaders to be involved in the recognition.

Additionally, this study draws attention to the importance of providing job-specific transition assistance to the reservist. This research shows that citizen-soldiers need and want time, training, education, and opportunities to bring their former job skills back to pre-deployment levels.

Perhaps most importantly, this study indicates the need for managers and supervisors to talk with returning reservists, to ask them about their deployment experiences, assess what help they need to reintegrate to their jobs, provide them with a summary of changes in policy and procedures, and answer their questions and concerns.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Several limitations of this current study must be considered when interpreting these results. First, non-random sampling procedures were used to generate the sample. Using the snowball technique and Facebook limited participant recruitment to reservists with some connection to the researcher or to those with Facebook profiles identifying their Army Reserve or National Guard affiliation. Additionally, the sample size was relatively small and more so for reservists who held full-time jobs with civilian organizations.

Another limitation is that reservists completed all commitment scales after they returned from deployment. Particularly for pre-deployment measures, results are limited by participants' recall or memory of their experiences.

Related to several of the limitations are areas for future research. First, while this study intended to examine the differences in pre- and post-deployment

commitment levels, findings could be strengthened by performing a longitudinal study. Ideally, reservists would complete the commitment scales for both their military and civilian organization prior to deployment. Then, within three months after returning to their civilian organization, they would complete the post-deployment commitment measures. Findings would be strengthened because outcomes are not based upon recall or memory.

Another consideration for future study is to measure participants' satisfaction level with media used to communicate with civilian colleagues. These findings could strengthen the argument that CMC is effective in interpersonal communication and relationship maintenance. Additionally, future research could explore the effects of multiple channels on creation or expansion of multiplex relationships.

More in-depth assessment of message content would also be beneficial. This study asked about the content of messages received, but not about the desired content of messages. Equally helpful would be determining the message content that reservists' believe would facilitate their reintegration to the civilian workplace and strengthen commitment. Understanding the information reservists are interested in knowing from the civilian organization can assist colleagues support deployed citizen-soldiers.

Finally, additional research on understanding the interaction of commitment to two distinct and culturally different organizations is warranted. Findings from this study indicated actions concerning one organization subsequently affected commitment to the other organization. This information would be beneficial to

civilian and military organizations to assist with development of recruiting and retention plans.

Conclusion

The intent of this study was to explore the relationship of communication during military deployment on the post-deployed reservists' reported changes in reservists' affective, normative, and continuance commitment levels to their civilian and military organizations. Frequency of communication, channels of communication, deployment experiences, and change to the civilian organization were also examined.

Overall, the results indicated that military reservists' affective, normative, and continuance commitment levels to both their civilian and military organizations showed a statistically significant decrease after deployment. The only exception was to continuance commitment to the civilian organization, which experienced an increase, although not statistically significant. Messages expressing support and encouraging the reservist to be safe, changes in the civilian workplace, and being satisfied with recognition during reintegration to the civilian organization were found to be associated with changes in commitment.

References

- Adler, N. (1981). Re-entry: Managing cross-cultural transitions. *Group and Organizational Studies*, 6, 341-356.
- Allen, M. W. (1992). Communication and organizational commitment: Perceived organizational support as a mediating factor. *Communication Quarterly*, 40, 357-367.
- Allen, M. W. (1995). Communication concepts related to perceived organizational support. *Western Journal of Communication*, 59, 326-346.
- Allen, M. W. (1996). The relationship between communication, affect, job alternatives, and voluntary turnover intentions. *Southern Communication Journal*, 61, 198-209.
- Allen, N. J. (2003). Organizational commitment in the military: A discussion of theory and practice. *Military Psychology*, 15, 237-253.
- Allen, D., & Alvarez, S. (1998). Empowering expatriates and organizations to improve repatriation effectiveness. *Human Resource Planning*, 21, 29-39.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 62, 1-18.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49, 252-276.

- Andreason, A. W., & Kinneer, K. D. (2005). Repatriation adjustment problems and the successful reintegration of expatriates and their families. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 6, 109-126.
- Andrews, L. W. (2004). Aftershocks of war. *HR Magazine*, 49(4), 64-70.
- Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L. (1986). Dual commitment and labor-management relationship climates. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29, 31-50.
- Army National Guard (2004, December 29). National Guard and Reserve mobilized as of 29 December 2004 [News Release]. Retrieved February 16, 2005, from The Army National Guard web site http://www.arng.army.mil/news/news_view.asp
- Army National Guard (2009, June 2). National Guard (in federal status) and Reserve activated as of June 2, 2009 [News Release]. Retrieved June 15, 2009, from The Army National Guard web site <http://www.arng.army.mil/default.aspx>
- Babbie, Earl. (2004). *The practice of social research* (10th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bailey, B. (2007). The Army in the marketplace: Recruiting an all-volunteer force. *The Journal of American History*, 94, 47-74.
- Baruch, Y., Steele, D. J., & Quantrill, G. A. (2002). Management of expatriation and repatriation for novice global player. *International Journal of Manpower*, 23, 659-674.
- Bateman, T. S., & Strasser, S. 1984. A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27, 95-112.

- Baym, N. K. (2000). *Tune in, log on: Soaps, fandom, and online community*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Baym, N. K. (2009). A call for grounding in the face of blurred boundaries. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14, (720-723).
- Becker, H. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32-42.
- Becker, T. E. (1992). Foci and bases of commitment: Are they distinctions worth making? *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 232-244.
- Benoit, W. L., & Holbert, R. L. (2008). Empirical intersections in communication research: Replication, multiple quantitative methods, and bridging the quantitative-qualitative divide. *Journal of Communication*, 58, 615-628.
- Black, J. S., & Gregersen, H. B. (1999). The right way to manage expats. *Harvard Business Review*, 77, 52-63.
- Black, J. S., Gregersen, H. B., & Mendenhall, M. E. (1992). Toward a theoretical framework of repatriation adjustment. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23, 737-760.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Carruthers, M., & Harnett, C. A. (2008). *Workplace warriors: The corporate response to deployment and reintegration* [White paper]. Retrieved from http://www.dmec.org/associations/5959/files/022708_FINAL_DMEC_White_Paper.pdf

- Clinton, Hillary R. (2004, September 21). *Transforming the Reserve Component for the 21st Century*. Presented at the Association of the U.S. Army, Center for American Progress, and Georgetown University's Center for Peace and Security Studies Conference. Retrieved May 14, 2005 from <http://clinton.senate.gov/~clinton/speeches/2004924704.html>
- Cox, J. B. (2004). The role of communication, technology, and cultural identity in repatriation adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 28, 201-219.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational information requirements, media richness and structural design. *Management Science*, 32, 554-571.
- Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1984). Information richness: A new approach to managerial behavior and organization design. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 6, 191-233.
- Daft, R. L., Lengel, R. H., & Trevino, L. K. (1987). Message equivocality, media selection, and manager performance: Implication for information systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 11, 355-366.
- Daywalt, T., & Herman, R. (2006). Employee relations during military deployments. *Employment Relations Today*, 32(4), 49-53. Doi: 10.1002/ert.20090
- Deligiannis, A. (2003, September). Corporations brace for influx of returning reservists. *Corporate Legal Times*, 22-23.

- Dunham, R. B., Grube, J. A., & Castaneda, M. B. (1994). Organizational commitment: The utility of an integrative definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 370–380.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 500-507.
- Ender, M. G., & Segal, D. R. (1995). V(E)-mail to the foxhole: Soldier isolation, (tele)communication, and force-projection operations. *Journal of Political and Military Sociology, 24*, 83-104.
- Ender, M. G., & Segal, D. R. (1998). Cyber-soldiering: Race, class, gender, and new media use in the U. S. Army. In B. Edo (Ed.), *Cyberghetto or cybertopia? Race, class, and gender on the internet* (pp. 65-81). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Fields, D. L. (2002). *Taking the measure of work: A guide to validated scales for organizational research and diagnosis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Forward, G. L., Daugherty, N., Michel, H., and Sandberg, D. (2009). The effects of communication, religiosity, and organizational support on student commitment at a church-related university. *Human Communication, 12*, 33-52.
- Friedman, M. J. (2006). Posttraumatic stress disorder among military returnees from Afghanistan and Iraq. *The American Journal of Psychiatry, 163*, 586-593.
- GMAC (2004). *Global relocation trends 2003/2004 survey report*. Retrieved from <http://www.nftc.org/default/hr/GRTS%202003-4.pdf>

- Garbardella, L. C. (2008). Role-exit theory and marital discord following extended military deployment. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, 44, 169-174.
- Grant, A. M., Dutton, J. E., & Rosso, B. D. (2008). Giving commitment: Employee support programs and the prosocial sensemaking process. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51, 898-918.
- Griffith, J. (2005). The Army National Guard soldier in post-9/11 operations: Perceptions of being prepared for mobilization, deployment, and combat. *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, 33, 161-177.
- Griffith, J. (2009). After 9/11, what kind of reserve soldier? Considerations given to emerging demands, organizational orientation, and individual commitment. *Armed Forces & Society*, 35, 214-240.
- Gutierrez, P. M., & Brenner, L. A. (2009). Introduction: Helping military personnel and recent veterans manage stress reactions. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 2, 95-100.
- Hackett, R. D., Bycio, P., & Hausdorf, P. A. (1994). Further assessments of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 15-23.
- Haythornthwaite, C. (2005). Social networks and Internet connectivity effects. *Information, Communication & Society*, 8, 125-147.

- Hitt, M. A., Bierman, L., Shimizu, K., & Kochhar, R. (2001). Direct and moderating effects of human capital on strategy and performance in professional service firms: A resource-based perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 13-26.
- Hoge, C. W., Auchterlonie, J. L., & Milliken, C. S. (2006). Mental health problems, use of mental health services, and attrition from military service after returning from deployment to Iraq or Afghanistan. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 295, 1023-1032.
- Hyder, A. S., & Lovblad, M. (2007). The repatriation process – a realistic approach. *Career Development International*, 12, 264-281.
- Jaros, S. J. (1997). An assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 319-337.
- Jassawalla, A., Connolly, T., & Slojkowski, L. (2004). Issues of effective repatriation: A model and managerial implications. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 69(2), 38-46.
- Johnson, J. D., Donohue, W. A., Atkin, C. K., & Johnson S. (1994). Differences between formal and informal communication channels. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 31, 111-122.

- Kang, H. K., Natelson, B. H., Mahan, C. M., Lee, K. Y., & Murphy, F. M. (2003). Post-traumatic stress disorder and chronic fatigue syndrome-like illness among Gulf War veterans: A population-based survey of 30,000 veterans. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 157, 141-148.
- Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and social organization: A study of commitment mechanisms in Utopian communities. *American Sociological Review*, 33, 499-517.
- Kirby, S. N., & Naftel, S. (2000). The impact of deployment on the retention of military reservists. *Armed Forces & Society*, 26, 259-284.
- Korb, L., Rundlet, P., Bergmann, M., Duggan, S., & Juul, P. (2007, March 6). *Beyond the call of duty: A comprehensive review of the overuse of the Army in the administration's war of choice in Iraq*. Retrieved May 16, 2007, from http://americanprogress.org/issues/2007/03/readiness_report.html
- LaBash, H. A. J., Vogt, D. S., King, L. A., & King, D. W. (2009). Deployment stressors of the Iraq War: Insights from the mainstream media. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24, 231-258.
- Lapierre, C. B., Schwegler, A. F., & LaBauve, B. J. (2007). Posttraumatic stress and depression symptoms in soldiers returning from combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 20, 933-943.
- LaRose, R., & Whitten, P. (2000). Re-thinking instructional immediacy for web courses: A social cognitive exploration. *Communication Education*, 49, 320-338.

- Lindsay, J. (2005). Getting the numbers: The unacknowledged work in recruiting for survey research. *Field Methods*, 17, 119-128.
- Lineberry, T. W., Bostwick, J. M., & Rundell, J. R. (2006). U. S. troops returning home: Are you prepared? *Current Psychiatry*, 5(1), 13-22.
- Litoff, J. B., & Smith D. C. (1990). "Will he get my letter?": Popular portrayals of mail and morale during World War II." *Journal of Popular Culture*, 23(4), 21-43.
- Loughran, D. S., Klerman, J. A., & Savych, B. (2006). *The effect of reserve activations and active-duty deployments on local employment during the global war on terrorism*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Lynch, M., & Stover, W. (2008). A turbulent transition: The Army National Guard and Army Reserve's movement to an operational reserve. *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, 36, 65-87.
- MacDonald, S., & Arthur, N. (2005). Connecting career management to repatriation adjustment. *Career Development International*, 10, 145-158.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 538-551.
- Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review, 11*, 299-326.
- Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 152-156.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*, 20-52.
- Miller, K. E., Weine, S. M., Ramic, A., Brkic, N., Bjedic, Z. D., Smajkic, A., & et al. (2002). The relative contribution of war experiences and exile-related stressors to levels of psychological distress among Bosnian refugees. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 15*, 377-387.
- Milliken, C. S., Auchterlonie, J. L., & Hoge, C. W. (2007, November 14). Longitudinal assessment of mental health problems among active and reserve component soldiers returning from the Iraq War. *Journal of American Medical Association, 298*, 2141-2148.

- Morrison, R. (2004). Informal relationships in the workplace: Associations with job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 33, 114-128.
- Moskos, C. (2005). A new concept of the citizen-soldier. *Orbis*, 49, 663-676.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Murray, J. A. (1973). International personnel repatriation: Cultural shock in reverse. *MSU Business Topic*, 21(2), 59-66.
- National Defense Authorization Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-181, § 532 (2008).
- O'Conner, R. (2002). Plug the expatriate knowledge drain. *HR Magazine*, 47(10), 101-107.
- Operation Order 08-102 (Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program). (2008). Retrieved June 4, 2009, from <https://www.arfp.org>
- Owen, W. F. (1984). Interpretive themes in relational communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70, 274-287.
- Palmeri, C., Grow, B., & Crock, S. (2004, December 13). Served in Iraq? Come work for us. *BusinessWeek*, i3912, 78-80.
- Postmes, T., Tanis, M., and de Wit, B. (2001). Communication and commitment in organizations: A social identity approach. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 4, 227-246.

- Raabe, B., & Beehr, T. A. (2003). Formal mentoring versus supervisor and coworker relationships: Differences in perceptions and impact. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 271-293.
- Randall, D. M., Fedor, D. B., & Longenecker, C. O. (1990). The behavioral expression of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 36, 210-224.
- Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 465-476.
- Renshaw, K. D., Rodrigues, C. S., & Jones, D. H. (2009). Combat exposure, psychological symptoms, and marital satisfaction in National Guard soldiers who served in Operation Iraqi Freedom from 2005 to 2006. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, 1, 101 – 115.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 698-714.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 825-836.
- Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 257-266.
- Riordan, C. M., & Griffeth, R. W. (1995). The opportunity for friendship in the workplace: An underexplored construct. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 10, 141-154.

- Rousmaniere, P. (2009). Dealing with scar issues. *Risk & Insurance*, 20(10), 28-31.
- Russo, T., & Benson, S. (2005). Learning with invisible others: Perceptions of online presence and their relationship to cognitive and affective learning. *Educational Technology & Society*, 8(1), 54-62.
- Russo, T. C. (1998). Organizational and professional identification. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 12, 72-111.
- Schumm, W. R., Bell, D. B., Ender, M. G., & Rice, R. E. (2004). Expectations, use and evaluation of communication media among deployed peacemakers. *Armed Forces & Society*, 30, 2004.
- Settle, T. (2006). *Maintaining small business support in times of increased Army National Guard utilization: An impending crisis* [Electronic Version]. Unpublished master's thesis, U.S. Army War College, Retrieved March 4, 2007, from <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdf/files/ksil493.pdf>
- Schmidt, K-H. (2007). Organizational commitment: A further moderator in the relationship between work stress and strain? *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14, 26-40.
- Scully, M. (2008, March 19). Defense general: Army reliance on National Guard won't diminish. *CongressDaily/P.M.* Retrieved from Factiva database.
- Shore, L. M., & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior: Comparison of affective and continuance commitment with perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 774-780.

- Short, J., Williams, E., & Christie, B. (1976). *The social psychology of telecommunications*. London: John Wiley.
- Sias, P. M. (2005). Workplace relationship quality and employee information experiences. *Communication Studies*, 56, 375-395.
- Sias, P. M., & Cahill, D. J. (1998). From coworkers to friends: The development of peer friendships in the workplace. *Western Journal of Communication*, 62, 273-299.
- Somers, M. J. (1995). Organizational commitment, turnover and absenteeism: An examination of direct and interaction effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 49-58.
- Stetz, M. C., Castro, C. A.; & Bliese, P. D. (2007). The impact of deactivation uncertainty, workload, and organizational constraints on reservists' psychological well-being and turnover intentions. *Military Medicine*, 172, 576-580.
- Stuart, J. A., & Bliese P. D. (1998). The long-term effects of operation desert storm on the psychological distress of U.S. Army Reserve and National Guard veterans. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 1-22.
- Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 43, 259-293.

- Trobetta, J. J., & Rogers, D. P. (1988). Communication climate, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment: The effects of information adequacy, communication openness, and decision participation. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 1, 494-514.
- Turner, J. W., Grube, J. A., & Meyers, J. (2001). Developing an optimal match within online communities: An exploration of CMC support communities and traditional support. *Journal of Communication*, 51, 231-251.
- van Knippenberg, D., & Sleenbos, E. (2006). Organizational identification versus organizational commitment: Self-definition, social exchange, and job attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 571-584.
- Walther, J. B. (1996). Computer-mediated communication: Impersonal, interpersonal, and hyperpersonal interaction. *Communication Research*, 23, 3-43.
- Warner, F. (2003, April 13). Carrying on when suits are in camouflage. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>
- Waterhouse, M., & O'Bryant, J. (2008, January 17). *National Guard personnel and deployments: Fact sheet* (CRS Report for Congress RS22451). Retrieved March 5, 2008, from Federation of American Scientists via: <http://www.fas.org/sgpcrs/natsec/RS22451.pdf>
- Weiner, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 418-428.
- Wellman, B., & Haythornthwaite, C. (Eds.) (2002). *The Internet in everyday life*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

- Wheeler, D. P. & Bragin, M. (2007). Bringing it all back home: Social work and the challenge of returning veterans. *Health & Social Work, 32*, 297-300.
- Wong, L. & Gerras, S. (2006). *CU@The FOB: How the forward operating base is changing the life of combat soldiers* (Publication 645). Retrieved from Strategic Studies Institute:
<http://www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?PubID=645>
- Wright, K. B. (2004). On-line relational maintenance strategies and perceptions of partners within exclusively internet-based and primarily internet-based relationships. *Communication Studies, 55*, 239-254.
- Wright, P. M., Dunford, B. B., & Snell, S. A. (2001). Human resources and the resource based view of the firm. *Journal of Management, 27*, 701-721.
- Zajac, B. (2000, July 24). Global giants. *Forbes, 166*(3), 335-338. Retrieved May 3, 2008, from Business Source Premier database.

Appendix A

Facebook Message to Friends

Dear friends:

As most of you know, I'm working on my doctorate at the University of Kansas. For my dissertation I am examining the effects of communication during deployment on the reintegration of Army National Guard members and Army Reservists.

I really need your help in finding participants to complete my online survey. It should take no more than 30 minutes to complete; all responses are confidential and anonymous.

If you know any Army National Guard or Reserve members who were deployed in support of our Middle East operations, would you ask them to complete my survey?

If they agree, please send me their military email address and I will send them the survey link.

I'm hoping to get respondents within the next two weeks. Thank you for your help.

Beverly Payne
PhD Candidate
Department of Communication Studies
University of Kansas

Appendix B

Facebook Message to those who have Army National Guard or

Army Reserve Membership in their Profile

First, thank you for your willingness to sacrifice so much to serve our great nation.

Second, please let me introduce myself. My name is Beverly Payne and I am a PhD student at the University of Kansas.

For my dissertation I am studying the effects of communication during deployment on the reintegration of Army National Guard and Army Reserve members. Having watched several family members go through this adjustment process, I am hoping to offer solutions to civilian employers and unit leaders on how to better support their citizen-soldiers.

If you have returned from a deployment in support of our Middle East operations, would you help me with my research by completing an online survey? It takes approximately 30 minutes to complete and all responses are anonymous and confidential.

To access the survey, copy and paste the link below into your web browser.

http://kuclas.qualtrics.com/SE?SID=SV_8reCIv8R65fNKxC&SVID=Prod

If you know of others from your unit who might be willing to complete the survey, please consider forwarding my request to them.

With your help, I can have enough completed surveys to begin analyzing my results by 16 February. Again, thank you for your service and any help you are willing to offer me.

Beverly Payne
PhD Candidate
Department of Communication Studies
University of Kansas

Appendix C

Facebook Message to Soldiers Named in News Articles

First, thank you for your service to our country. I recently read where you and your unit returned from Afghanistan. If you aren't SPC Alaniz from the Oregon National Guard, I apologize for bothering you.

Second, please let me introduce myself. My name is Beverly Payne and I am a PhD student at the University of Kansas. For my dissertation I am studying the effects of communication during deployment on the reintegration of Army National Guard and Army Reserve members. Having watched several family members go through this adjustment process, I am hoping to offer solutions to civilian employers and unit leaders on how to better support their citizen-soldiers.

Would you help me with my research by completing an online survey? It takes approximately 30 minutes to complete and all responses are anonymous and confidential.

To access the survey, copy and paste the link below into your web browser.

http://kuclas.qualtrics.com/SE?SID=SV_8reCIv8R65fNKxC&SVID=Prod

If you know of others from your unit who might be willing to complete the survey, please consider forwarding my request to them.

Again, thank you for your service and any help you are willing to offer me.

Beverly Payne
PhD Candidate
Department of Communication Studies
University of Kansas

Appendix D

Informed Consent

The Department of Communication Studies supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research. The following information is provided for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You may decline to participate. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time. To withdraw, simply close the browser window without hitting "submit." If you do withdraw from this study, it will not affect your relationship with this unit, the services it may provide to you, or the University of Kansas.

We are conducting this study to better understand perceptions citizen-soldiers have about how communicating with civilian colleagues and non-deployed National Guard or Reserve members during deployment affected their organizational commitment. This will entail your completion of a questionnaire, which is expected to take about 30 minutes to complete.

The content of the questionnaire should cause no more discomfort than you would experience in your everyday life. Although participation may not benefit you directly, we believe that the information obtained from this study will help us gain a better understanding of the perceptions citizen-soldiers have about how communicating with colleagues during deployment. Your participation is solicited, although strictly voluntary. Your name will not be associated in any way with the research findings.

If you would like additional information concerning this study before or after it is completed, please contact me by phone or mail. Completion of the survey indicates your willingness to participate in the study and that you are over the age of 18. If you have additional questions about your rights as a research participant, you may call (785) 864-7429 or write the Human Subjects Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL), University of Kansas, 2385 Irving Hill Road, Lawrence, KS 6645-7563, email dhann@ku.edu.

Sincerely,

Beverly Payne
Principal Investigator
Department of Communication Studies
102 Bailey Hall, 1440 Jayhawk Blvd.
Lawrence, KS 66045
816-431-6349
bpayne10@ku.edu

Tracy Russo, Ph.D.
Faculty Supervisor
Department of Communication Studies
102 Bailey Hall, 1440 Jayhawk Blvd.
Lawrence, KS 66045
785-864-9877
trusso@ku.edu

Appendix E

Survey

Survey

This survey asks a variety of questions about your feelings and attitudes, both before and after your military deployment, toward your civilian employer and National Guard or Reserve unit. The terms civilian employer and civilian organization refer to your non-military employer at the time you were deployed overseas.

Specifically, questions will be asked about your communication with colleagues from both your civilian and military organizations during your deployment.

First, please tell us a little about you. Remember that all of your responses are completely anonymous.

Sex

- ☐ Male
☐ Female

What was your age on your last birthday?

Which of the following best represents your ethnic background?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> African-American | <input type="radio"/> Non-Hispanic White (Caucasian) |
| <input type="radio"/> Asian or Pacific Islander | <input type="radio"/> Spanish or Hispanic origin |
| <input type="radio"/> Multi-racial or Mixed Race | <input type="radio"/> Other <input type="text"/> |
| <input type="radio"/> Native American | |

My marital status during my deployment was

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Single | <input type="radio"/> Married, with children | <input type="radio"/> Separated, no children |
| <input type="radio"/> Single, steady partner | <input type="radio"/> Widowed | <input type="radio"/> Separated, with children |
| <input type="radio"/> Married, no children | <input type="radio"/> Divorced | <input type="radio"/> Other <input type="text"/> |

The highest level of education I have completed is best described as

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> High school diploma or GED | <input type="radio"/> Bachelor's Degree |
| <input type="radio"/> Some college | <input type="radio"/> Master's Degree |
| <input type="radio"/> Associate Degree | <input type="radio"/> Master's Degree plus additional hours |

Select the category below that best describes your civilian employment status at the time you were deployed.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Employed, full time for a civilian employer (other than your Reserve/Guard unit) | <input type="radio"/> Employed, full or part time in civilian position with Reserve/Guard unit in addition to Reserve/Guard military commitment |
| <input type="radio"/> Employed, part time for a civilian employer (other than your Reserve/Guard unit) | <input type="radio"/> Unemployed other than my Reserve/Guard military commitment |

Which industry best describes your civilian employment?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Forestry, fishing, hunting and agriculture support | <input type="radio"/> Real estate & rental & leasing |
| <input type="radio"/> Mining | <input type="radio"/> Professional, scientific & technical services |
| <input type="radio"/> Utilities | <input type="radio"/> Management of companies & enterprises |
| <input type="radio"/> Construction | <input type="radio"/> Admin, support, waste mgt, remediation services |
| <input type="radio"/> Manufacturing | <input type="radio"/> Education |
| <input type="radio"/> Wholesale trade | <input type="radio"/> Health care and social assistance |
| <input type="radio"/> Retail trade | <input type="radio"/> Arts, entertainment & recreation |
| <input type="radio"/> Transportation & warehousing | <input type="radio"/> Accommodation & food services |
| <input type="radio"/> Information | <input type="radio"/> Other services (except public administration) |
| <input type="radio"/> Finance & insurance | <input type="radio"/> Government - federal, state, or local |

What was your CIVILIAN job title at the time you deployed?

Which category best fits your **CIVILIAN** job prior to your deployment?

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Executive | <input type="radio"/> Non-supervisory, but not entry-level |
| <input type="radio"/> Manager | <input type="radio"/> Entry-level |
| <input type="radio"/> Director | <input type="radio"/> Owner or sole proprietor |
| <input type="radio"/> Supervisor | <input type="radio"/> Other <input type="text"/> |

At the time you were deployed, how long had you been employed by your CIVILIAN employer?

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Less than 6 months | <input type="radio"/> 5 to 7 years |
| <input type="radio"/> 6 months to 1 year | <input type="radio"/> 8 to 9 years |
| <input type="radio"/> 1 to 2 years | <input type="radio"/> 10+ years |
| <input type="radio"/> 3 to 4 years | |

This next group of questions is about your feelings and attitudes toward your CIVILIAN organization BEFORE you deployed.

Think about your feelings and attitudes toward your CIVILIAN organization BEFORE you were deployed. Then, select the answer that best indicates the degree you agree with each of the following statements about your CIVILIAN organization BEFORE you were deployed.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Prior to my deployment, I would have been happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Before my deployment, I would have not left my organization because I had a sense of obligation to the people in it.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, I did not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Before my deployment, I felt this organization deserved my loyalty.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Before my deployment, I would have felt guilty if I left my organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, I really felt as if this organization's problems were my own.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
			Neither Agree nor Disagree		
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Before my deployment, I felt that I had too few options to consider leaving the organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My co-workers were sorry to see me leave for deployment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Before my deployment, even if it were to my advantage, I did not feel it would be right to leave my organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I was considering looking for another job at the time I was deployed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Before my deployment, I did not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Before my deployment, one of the major reasons I continued to work for this organization was that leaving would have required considerable personal sacrifice -- another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
			Neither Agree nor Disagree		
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Before my deployment, one of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization was the scarcity of available alternatives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I liked my job that I had before I was deployed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisor or supervisors were sorry to see me leave for deployment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, I did not feel a strong sense of 'belonging' to my organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, this organization had a great deal of personal meaning for me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, I did not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I was actively looking for another job at the time I was deployed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, I felt I owed a great deal to my organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Before my deployment, staying with my organization was a matter of necessity as much as desire.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Before my deployment, it would have been very hard for me to leave my organization, even if I wanted to.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Before my deployment, too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave the organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The next group of questions asks about your communication during deployment with people from your civilian organization.

How did you communicate with the following people while you were deployed? Mark all methods of communication that you used.

	Did Not Communicate With Anyone in this Group	E-Mail	Telephone (Landline)	Cellular Phone	Mail	Video Chat (Skype, DCO, etc.)	Text Chat (Twitter, Instant Messaging, etc.)	Social Networking Sites (Facebook, My Space, etc.)	Used Other Means to Communicate
Co-workers, civilian organization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Supervisors, civilian organization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Management, other than my supervisor, civilian organization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you answered that you used other means to communicate, what did you use?

Did you respond that you "did not communicate with anyone in this group" during your deployment to ALL three groups of people?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Which communication method did you use the MOST to communicate with your CIVILIAN work colleagues during your deployment?

☐ E-mail

☐ Telephone (Landline)

☐ Cellular phone

☐ Mail

☐ Video chat

☐ Text chat

☐ Social networking sites

☐ Other

Select the answer that best describes your level of agreement with the following statements about communication with your CIVILIAN organization or with others about your civilian organization during your deployment.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
My civilian co-workers communicated with me regularly while I was deployed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisor(s) communicated with me regularly while I was deployed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I received company newsletters or other company information during my deployment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Business connections, other than my civilian co-workers or supervisors communicated with me while I was deployed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My co-workers' messages were about their personal lives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisors' messages focused on work topics.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
In their messages, my co-workers focused on telling me to take care of myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My co-workers were more interested in hearing what I was doing than in telling me about their activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisors' messages were about their personal lives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My supervisors were more interested in hearing what I was doing than in telling me about their activities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In their messages, my supervisors focused on telling me to take care of myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Messages from my civilian co-workers focused on work topics.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
During my deployment, I communicated with my family about my civilian organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My civilian work colleagues communicated with my family while I was deployed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My family received company newsletters while I was deployed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The company included my family in activities for employees and families of employees during my absence.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

On average, during your deployment how frequently did you communicate with the following people using any communication method?

	Never	Almost Daily	Once Weekly	Several Times Monthly	Monthly	Less Often than Monthly
Co-workers, civilian organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supervisors, civilian organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Management, other than my supervisor, civilian organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The next group of questions asks you about your CIVILIAN organization AFTER you returned from deployment.

Now, think about your feelings and attitudes toward your CIVILIAN organization AFTER you returned from deployment. Then, select the answer that best reflects your level of agreement with each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I owe a great deal to this organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This organization deserves my loyalty.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would have required considerable personal sacrifice -- another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving the organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel more committed than ever to my civilian organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Right now staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I am looking to change jobs now.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not feel a strong sense of 'belonging' to my organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
			Neither Agree nor Disagree		
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel far less commitment to my company than before my deployment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The work I am doing in my civilian job now is very different from the work I did before my deployment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about changes in your CIVILIAN organization.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
While deployed I was not interested in what was happening at my civilian organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The civilian workplace I came back to was very different from the one I left.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Few changes took place in my civilian organization during my deployment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel less committed to my civilian organization because of leadership changes during my deployment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Relationships with my civilian co-workers were unchanged when I returned to my job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel less committed to my organization because my job changed when I returned after deployment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt as if I was included in changes or big news at work while I was deployed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When I returned to my civilian job, I did not lose seniority or status in my organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel less committed to my company because of policy changes during my deployment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I was satisfied with the recognition I received for my military service by my civilian organization when I returned to work after deployment.

- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Strongly Agree

How else would you have wanted your civilian employer to recognize you once you returned from deployment?

What, if anything, did your civilian organization do when you returned to work to help you adjust from soldier to civilian employee? Please be specific.

What else could they have done to help you with this transition?

Are you currently employed with the same civilian employer that you were prior to deployment? If not, please enter the reason for leaving in the box.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

The following questions ask about your Reserve or National Guard unit.

Think about your feelings and attitudes toward your reserve or National Guard unit **BEFORE** you were deployed. Then, select the answer that best reflects your level of agreement with each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Prior to my deployment, I would have been very happy to spend the rest of my military career with this unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, I really felt as if this unit's problems were my own.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, I did not feel like 'part of the family' at my unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, this unit had a great deal of personal meaning for me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, I did not feel a strong sense of 'belonging' to my unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Before my deployment, it would have been very hard for me to leave my unit, even if I wanted to.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Before my deployment, too much in my life would have been disrupted if I had decided I wanted to leave the unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Before my deployment, staying with my unit was a matter of necessity as much as desire.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Before my deployment, one of the few serious consequences of leaving this unit was the scarcity of available alternatives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, I felt my unit deserved my loyalty.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, I did not feel 'emotionally attached' to this unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, one of the major reasons I continued to work for this unit was that leaving would have required considerable personal sacrifice -- another unit may not match the overall benefits I have here.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Before my deployment, I did not feel any obligation to remain with my current unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, even if it were to my advantage, I did not feel it would be right to leave my unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Before my deployment, I felt that I had too few options to consider leaving the unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, I would feel guilty if I left my unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, I would not have left my unit because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Before my deployment, I felt I owed a great deal to this unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Prior to my deployment, I was thinking about completing my military service obligation and seeking an honorable discharge.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The next group of questions ask about your communication during deployment with people from your Reserve or National Guard unit.

How did you communicate with the following people while you were deployed? Mark all methods of communication that you used.

[illegible]

Did you respond that you "did not communicate with anyone in this group" during your deployment for BOTH groups of people?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Which communication method did you use the MOST to communicate with non-deployed members of your RESERVE/NATIONAL GUARD unit?

- ☐ E-mail
 ☐ Mail
 ☐ Social networking sites
☐ Telephone (landline)
 ☐ Video chat
 ☐ Other
☐ Cellular phone
 ☐ Text chat

On average, during your deployment how frequently did you communicate with the following people using any communication method?

[illegible]

The following questions ask about your deployment experiences.

Select the answer that best represents your level of agreement with the following statements about your deployment experiences.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
During deployment, I had more job responsibilities in my military job as compared to my civilian job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The potential consequences of the decisions I made while deployed were greater than those made in my civilian job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
During deployment, I had more decision making authority in my military job as compared to my civilian job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My family experienced financial difficulties because of my deployment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I was satisfied with the benefits my civilian organization continued to provide my family while I was deployed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I was more satisfied with the military job I performed while deployed than with my civilian job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The job I performed while deployed was more important than my current job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am a different person now than before I left for deployment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My military colleagues viewed me as a leader more than my civilian colleagues.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Indicate your level of exposure to combat during your deployment. Mark all that apply.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> None | <input type="checkbox"/> Received Combat Action Badge |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Present during indirect fire on my camp or base | <input type="checkbox"/> Received Purple Heart |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Present in a building, vehicle, or location while it received indirect fire | <input type="checkbox"/> Received Combat Patch |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Present in a building, vehicle, or location while it was hit by an IED, VBIED, or suicide bomb | <input type="checkbox"/> Received Combat Infantry Badge |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Present in a building, vehicle, or location while it was hit by direct fire | <input type="checkbox"/> Received Combat Medical Badge |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged enemy | <input type="checkbox"/> Assigned to unit that experienced casualties |

Now, think about your feelings and attitudes toward your reserve or National Guard unit AFTER you returned from deployment. Then, select the answer that best reflects your level of agreement with each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I feel far less commitment now to my Reserve/Guard unit than before my deployment.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I owe a great deal to this unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my unit now.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I really feel as if this unit's problems are my own.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel more committed now than ever to my Reserve/Guard unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
			Neither Agree nor Disagree		
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
One of the few serious consequences of leaving this unit is the scarcity of available alternatives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This unit has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not feel a strong sense of 'belonging' to my unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It would be very hard for me to leave my unit now, even if I wanted to.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Right now, staying with my unit is a matter of necessity as much as desire.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
			Neither Agree nor Disagree		
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
One of the major reasons I continue to work for this unit is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice -- another unit may not match the overall benefits that I have here.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My unit deserves my loyalty.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current unit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my unit now.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would feel guilty if I left my unit now.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would not leave my unit right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following questions are about your National Guard or Reserve unit and your deployment history.

The Reserve or National Guard unit that I was activated from is the

This unit is a

☐ National Guard unit

☐ Army Reserve unit

☐ Other

My military rank at the end of my deployment was

- ☐ E1 - E4 ☐ CW3 - CW5 ☐ O4 - O6
☐ E5 - E9 ☐ O1 - O3 ☐ O7 - O10
☐ CW1 - CW2

At the time I deployed, I had served in the National Guard or Army Reserves for

- ☐ Less than 6 months ☐ 5 - 7 years
☐ 6 months to 1 year ☐ 8 - 9 years
☐ 1 - 2 years ☐ 10+ years
☐ 3 - 4 years

Please indicate the month in two-digit format (for example, January = 01) and the year in four-digit format (for example, 2005) that you returned from your most recent deployment.

Month

Year

Including your most recent deployment, how many times have you been deployed for 6 or more months since 2001?

My most recent deployment in support of the war in the Middle East was to

- ☐ Iraq ☐ Other, CONUS
☐ Afghanistan ☐ Other, OCONUS

The Army branch or type of unit I was assigned to on my most recent deployment was

- ☐ Air Defense Artillery ☐ Infantry ☐ Ordnance Corps
☐ Armor ☐ Military Police Corps ☐ Quartermaster Corps
☐ Aviation ☐ Military Intelligence Corps ☐ Transportation Corps
☐ Chemical Corps ☐ Signal Corps ☐ Medical Service Corps
☐ Corps of Engineers ☐ Adjutant General's Corps ☐ Nurse Corps
☐ Field Artillery ☐ Finance ☐ Other

Appendix F

Intercorrelations Between Change in Commitment and Message Content

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1 Changes in AC, civilian	—	.67**	.19	-.11	-.13	-.11	.20	-.06	-.05	.14	.19	.07	-.15	.01
2 Changes in NC, civilian	.67**	—	.37**	-.26*	-.21	.00	.11	-.03	-.05	-.03	.10	.12	.03	-.22
3 Changes in CC, civilian	.19	.37**	—	-.14	.04	-.05	.12	-.02	-.20	.18	-.08	-.18	.05	-.07
4 Changes in AC, military	-.11	-.26*	-.14	—	.74**	.34**	.07	-.32**	-.44**	.02	.06	-.12	-.17	-.12
5 Changes in NC, military	-.13	-.21	.04	.74**	—	.40**	-.01	-.38**	-.47**	.01	.06	-.26*	-.22	-.18
6 Changes in CC, military	-.11	.00	-.05	.34**	.40**	—	-.13	-.29*	-.20	.02	.10	-.25*	.02	-.26*
7 Coworker messages, personal lives	.20	.11	.12	.07	-.01	-.13	—	.37**	.16	.12	.43**	.13	.06	.20
8 Coworker messages, take care of myself	-.06	-.03	-.02	-.32**	-.38**	-.29*	.37**	—	.52**	-.24	.04	.61**	.46**	.11
9 Coworkers more interested in me	-.05	-.05	-.20	-.44**	-.47**	-.20	.16	.52**	—	-.17	.07	.48**	.48**	-.01
10 Coworker messages, work topics	.14	-.03	.18	.02	.01	.02	.12	-.24	-.17	—	.07	-.19	-.08	.30*
11 Supervisor messages, personal lives	.19	.10	-.08	.06	.06	.10	.43**	.04	.07	.07	—	.14	.23	.02
12 Supervisor messages, take care of myself	.07	.12	-.18	-.12	-.26*	-.25*	.13	.61**	.48**	-.19	.14	—	.52**	-.06
13 Supervisor messages, interested in me	-.15	.03	.05	-.17	-.22	.02	.06	.46**	.48**	-.08	.23	.52**	—	-.18
14 Supervisor messages, work topics	.01	-.22	-.07	-.12	-.18	-.26*	.20	.11	-.01	.30*	.02	-.06	-.18	—
15 I communicated with family about civilian organization	.10	.13	.31*	-.05	-.05	.02								

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Appendix G

Intercorrelations Between Change in Commitment and Deployment Experiences

	Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1	Changes in AC, civilian	—	.67**	.19	-.11	-.13	-.11	.04	-.01	-.04	-.09	.07	-.23	-.15	-.11	-.05
2	Changes in NC, civilian	.67**	—	.37**	-.26*	-.21	.00	-.01	.04	-.03	-.20	.19	-.22	-.09	-.08	-.16
3	Changes in CC, civilian	.19	.37**	—	-.14	.04	-.05	-.05	-.01	.01	.10	.16	-.18	-.11	-.04	-.04
4	Changes in AC, military	-.11	-.26*	-.14	—	.74**	.34**	.03	.12	.16	-.03	-.24*	.27**	.21*	-.14	.21*
5	Changes in NC, military	-.13	-.21	.04	.74**	—	.40**	.02	.16	.10	.14	-.23*	.27**	.30**	-.02	.22*
6	Changes in CC, military	-.11	.00	-.05	.34**	.40**	—	-.03	-.02	.05	.06	-.09	.21*	.27**	-.05	.08
7	More responsibility, military job	.04	-.06	-.05	.03	.01	-.03	—	.69**	.69**	-.17	.10	.50**	.45**	-.02	.56**
8	Greater consequences of decisions, military	-.01	.04	-.01	.12	.16	-.02	.69**	—	.67**	-.16	.05	.50**	.53**	.13	.55**
9	More decision-making, military job	-.04	-.03	.01	.16	.10	.05	.69**	.67**	—	-.13	.05	.46**	.41**	.08	.59**
10	Family experienced financial difficulty	-.09	-.20	.10	-.03	.14	.06	-.17	-.16	-.13	—	-.07	-.14	-.16	.12	-.10
11	Satisfied, benefits from civilian org.	.07	.19	.16	-.24*	-.23*	-.09	.10	.05	.05	-.07	—	-.01	-.14	.09	-.02
12	More satisfied with military job	-.23	-.22	-.18	.27**	.23**	.21*	.50**	.50**	.46**	-.14	-.01	—	.67**	-.02	.52**
13	Military job more important	-.15	-.09	-.11	.21*	.30**	.27**	.45**	.53**	.41**	-.16	-.14	.67**	—	.05	.54**
14	I am a different person than before	-.11	-.08	-.04	-.14	-.02	-.05	-.02	.13	.08	.12	.09	-.02	.05	—	.32**
15	Viewed as a leader more in military job	-.05	-.16	-.04	.21*	.22*	.08	.56**	.55**	.59**	-.10	-.02	.52**	.54**	.32**	—

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Appendix H

Intercorrelations Between Change in Commitment and Perceived Changes in the Civilian Workplace

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1 Changes in AC, civilian	—	.67**	.19	-.11	-.13	-.11	-.03	.08	-.24*	.24*	-.30*	.12	-.34**	-.61**	.31**	-.39**	.37**
2 Changes in NC, civilian	.67**	—	.37**	-.26*	-.21	.00	-.20	.26*	-.35**	.32**	-.30*	.26*	-.36**	-.64**	.35**	-.36**	.49**
3 Changes in CC, civilian	.19	.37**	—	-.14	.04	-.05	.11	.03	.05	.17	-.04	.09	-.21	-.33**	.26*	-.06	.16
4 Changes in AC, military	-.11	-.26*	-.14	—	.74**	.34**	.18	-.09	.13	-.11	.18	-.12	.24*	.12	-.08	.25*	-.19
5 Changes in NC, military	-.13	-.21	.04	.74**	—	.40**	.13	-.07	.10	-.05	.17	-.15	.08	.06	-.20	.22	-.26*
6 Changes in CC, military	-.11	.00	-.05	.34**	.40**	—	-.06	.03	-.11	.02	-.02	-.07	-.14	.04	-.10	.08	-.14
7 Work is different	-.03	-.20	.11	.18	.13	-.06	—	.01	.35**	-.15	.28*	-.28*	.34**	.25*	-.18	.22	.19
8 Not interested, civilian job	.08	.26*	.03	-.09	-.07	.03	.01	—	-.13	.19	-.10	.03	-.05	-.01	-.08	-.05	-.07
9 Workplace is different	-.24*	-.35**	.05	.13	.01	-.11	.35**	-.13	—	-.42**	.62**	-.30*	.37**	.41**	-.18	.50**	-.31**
10 Few changes	.24*	.32**	.17	-.11	-.05	.02	-.14	.19	-.42**	—	-.28*	.11	-.14	-.30*	.23	-.28*	.22
11 Less committed, leadership changes	-.30*	-.30*	-.04	.18	.17	-.02	.28*	-.10	-.62**	-.28*	—	-.30*	.45**	.42**	-.33**	.60**	-.24*
12 Coworker relationships same	.12	.26*	.09	-.12	-.15	-.07	-.27*	.03	-.30*	.11	-.30*	—	-.46**	-.29*	.29*	-.21	.43**
13 Less committed, job changes	-.34**	-.36**	-.21	.24*	.08	-.14	.34**	-.05	.37**	-.14	.45**	-.46**	—	.41**	-.38**	.58**	-.39**
14 Feel less committed	-.61**	-.64**	-.33**	.12	.06	.04	.25*	-.01	.41**	-.29*	.42**	-.29*	.41**	—	-.32**	.47**	-.44**
15 Did not lose seniority	.31**	.35**	.26*	-.08	-.20	-.10	-.18	-.07	-.18	.23	-.33**	.29*	-.38**	-.32**	—	-.33**	.34**
16 Less commitment, policy changes	-.39**	-.36**	-.06	.25*	.22	.08	.22	-.05	.49**	-.28*	.59**	-.21	.58**	.47**	-.33**	—	-.40**
17 Satisfied with recognition	.34**	.49**	.16	-.19	-.26*	-.14	-.19	-.07	-.31**	.22	-.24*	.43**	.39**	-.43**	.34**	-.40**	—

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.